

George Sutton

1928

FC

L84

C

N22

1853

PROTEST

AND

COUNTER-STATEMENT

AGAINST THE

REPORT FROM THE SELECT COMMITTEE

ON THE

NATIONAL GALLERY

*Ordered, by The House of Commons, to be printed,  
4th of August, 1853.*

*"Ergo exploranda est veritas multum prius  
Quam stulta pravè judicet sententia."*

LONDON:  
JOHN RUSSELL-SMITH, 36, SOHO SQUARE.

MDCCCLV.

## The Members of the Committee.

---

COLONEL MURE, CHAIRMAN.

MR. LABOUCHERE

MR. CHARTERIS (Lord Elcho)

MR. STIRLING

MR. RAIKES CURRIE

MR. MONCKTON MILNES

MR. MARSHALL

LORD SEYMOUR

MR. VERNON

LORD BROOKE

MR. GOULBOURN

MR. EWART

MR. BARING WALL

SIR WILLIAM MOLESWORTH

MR. HARDINGE

LORD WILLIAM GRAHAM

MR. HAMILTON

N.B. Appendix No. III contains a Table of Contents.



## TO THE NATION.

ALL the Arts which pertain to man, says Cicero, have a certain bond of communion, and are held together as if in relationship. Hence, whatever affects any individual part of this sympathetic unity must of necessity affect each. The subject of the following PROTEST AND COUNTER-STATEMENT is therefore of *universal* interest.

But, besides this universal interest, the PROTEST AND COUNTER-STATEMENT claims the attention of ENGLISHMEN in particular on two grounds of special interest to themselves; to repudiate which were either to abjure the duties of a citizen, or to renounce common sense.

These grounds are:—

*First*, that it confronts and unmasks *perversion and misrepresentation of evidence*—A BETRAYAL OF TRUST—by a Committee of the Legislature.

*Secondly*, that it exposes PATRONAGE and JOBBERY in a National Institution, and their inevitable consequence, disorganization; a subject of ominous significance at the present crisis. The same system of PATRONAGE and JOBBERY which has immolated an army and plunged a Nation into mourning, flouts us in every department of the Public Service. In vain sit the Sebastopol Committee if the Nation remain content with an inquest on Jobbery in her army alone. To become regenerate, England must rouse herself, and “purging and unscaling her long-abused sight,” vigorously scan herself in every part of her organization. As well expect to purify a given spot in some reeking fen by draining that spot alone, as to heal a solitary member of the Body Politic while each remains infected. Corruption in *one* is corruption in *all*.

Such are the grounds on which the PROTEST AND COUNTER-STATEMENT rests its special claims to the attention of ENGLISHMEN.

The following is an outline of the circumstances which paved the way to the recent inquiry.

In November 1843, by the patronage of Sir R. Peel, Sir C. Eastlake was appointed Director of the National Gallery.\* He at once inaugurated that disastrous system of “cleaning” which culminated in the *razzia* of 1852. During his first two years of office he cleaned and considerably damaged ‘The Judgment of Paris’ by Rubens, and the two other Penrice pictures, ‘Lot and his Daughters,’ and ‘Susanna and

---

\* Eastlake's Evid. 4657-8.

the Elders.' The last-named picture was cleaned "*without the instructions of the Trustees.*" The result, however, "had their approval."\* It is stated in the evidence that "a letter of remonstrance against these proceedings was written to one of the Public Journals, but that it was not published."†

Emboldened by impunity, in the vacation of 1846, Sir C. Eastlake subjects to his searing process, the large Cuypp, the Cowley Velazquez, the 'Bacchus and Ariadne,' and the 'Peace and War.' The letters of "Verax" (Morris Moore), Mr. Coningham, and others, backed by editorial articles in the Press, now draw public attention to the cleaning.‡ But direct expostulation with the Trustees was not neglected. In the "Return of the Trustees," for which Mr. Hume moved on the 26th of January 1847, we read as follows:—

"At a Meeting of the Trustees of the National Gallery, held on Monday, the 25th of January 1847: Present,—The Right Hon. Lord Monteagle, in the Chair, The Right Hon. Sir James R. G. Graham, Bart., William Wells, Esq. Samuel Rogers, Esq.

"Read, A note from the Earl of Ellesmere to the Secretary, requesting him to lay before the Trustees a letter he had received from Mr. Morris Moore, of the 10th of December last, enclosed with his Lordship's communication; in which letter Mr. Moore states his opinion that three pictures, the 'Bacchus and Ariadne,' by Titian; the 'Peace and War,' by Rubens; and the newly purchased picture by Velazquez, have been injured in the cleaning they have recently undergone.

"Resolved, That this letter be referred to Mr. Eastlake, in order that he may report to the Trustees at their next meeting to be specially summoned to receive this report, the steps he has taken in pursuance of the minute of the Trustees of the 24th of August last,§ and his opinion on the present state of these pictures, and the proceedings resorted to in cleaning them, and their results; and that a copy of this minute be forwarded to the Earl of Ellesmere."||

At the Meeting of the 4th of February 1847, Sir C. Eastlake reads

\* Eastlake's Evid. 4387-93.

† Morris Moore's Evid. 2461.

‡ Times, Nov. and Dec. 1846, and Jan. 1847.

§ The following is the minute here referred to:—

"Mr. Eastlake reported to the Trustees, that some of the pictures in this Gallery stand in need of cleaning and other restorations.

"Resolved, That Mr. Eastlake is empowered by the Trustees to use his discretion in causing such pictures as appear to him in want of this treatment, to be cleaned and otherwise restored, by competent persons whom he shall select for the purpose, as far as practicable during the approaching vacation."

|| Min. of Trust. 1845-7, p. 11.



his report. "The Velazquez speaks for itself,"\* says he. "I consider it unnecessary to say any thing further on the subject. I beg leave to *repeat my entire satisfaction* at what has been done to the Titian, the Cuypp, the Velazquez, and the Rubens, and to express my acknowledgements to Mr. Segquier for the care with which he executed the task undertaken by him."†

The evidence of five colleagues of the accused, and of three dealers, is allowed to be put in for the defence; *none* for the *prosecution*.

Whereupon, it is "Resolved:"—

"That in the opinion of the Trustees the report so made by Mr. Eastlake is *entirely satisfactory*, and justifies the confidence which they have reposed in his judgment in respect to the treatment of the pictures in the National Gallery."‡

A new system of jurisprudence! The accused sit in judgment upon themselves and pronounce their own acquittal.

Thus was that inquiry smothered.

Sir C. Eastlake remains in the Keepership during the vacation of 1847, proves the justice of the charges and the *honesty* of the February Resolution, by NOT prosecuting his "entirely satisfactory" operations, and—RESIGNS.

But Mr. Uwins, "Curator of the Pictures in Her Majesty's possession" and Royal Academician, had spoken. "The cleaning is not only *entirely*, but *more than entirely satisfactory*." "Nothing can exceed the beauty which the pictures present as the effect of the picture-cleaner's skill. I have known 'The Rubens,'" says he, "*very many years*, but never knew its *value till now*. I cannot but look with *great respect* and *veneration* on an art that, conducted with judgment, experience, and taste, is capable of doing *so much towards restoring and perpetuating* these National treasures."§ Here then, without doubt, was the man sent to fill the gap left by Sir C. Eastlake's Apotheosis. So thought Lord John Russell, then Minister. Sir Robert Peel had placed Sir C. Eastlake in the Keepership. Lord John, now Sir Robert's rival in the Fine Arts as well as in the finer arts of Politics, sees his opportunity, and at once inducts Sir C. Eastlake's duplicate into the deserted

\* See Protest and Counter-Statement, p. 28.

† Min. of Trust. of 1845-7, p. 15.

‡ The parties who thus modestly proclaimed their own *sagacity* and *connoisseurship* were Lords Aberdeen, Lansdowne, Ellesmere, Montague, Sirs Robert Peel and James Graham and Messrs. Samuel Rogers and William Wells.

§ Uwins's Letter to Eastlake, Min. of Trust. of 1845-7, p. 18.



office. *Officially*, this was "the right man in the right place." The most ranting panegyrist of acts which had driven Sir C. Eastlake to resign, is Sir C. Eastlake's successor! Nevertheless, "it is better for the present," say the Trustees, "not to do anything which would produce *much effect* upon the pictures, and attract the particular notice of the Public." "If they were seen in *all* their beauty," says Mr. Uwins, "it would perhaps call down *a good deal of abuse*."\* So Mr. Academician Uwins consents to pocket the People's money, and to belie himself.

In 1847, by his resignation of the Keepership, Sir C. Eastlake had relinquished all *direct* connection with the National Gallery.† In 1850, now become President of the Royal Academy, we find him again in authority there, as Trustee "by virtue of his *office*." At the same period Mr. William Russell also becomes a Trustee: by what "virtue," there is no official record. Notwithstanding these powerful additions to the "Board of *Taste*," the Trustees as a body still "Resolve, That the cleaning be postponed." "Sir C. Eastlake had rather a strong recollection of what had passed on a former occasion"—in 1846.‡ The time was not yet ripe for again bringing into operation the "greatly respected and venerated art that is capable of doing so much towards perpetuating the National treasures in all their beauty." For six years the Great Masters were left unmolested. For six years Paul Veronese and Claude could spare sympathy for the ghastly remains of their noble companions, rendered still more ghastly by contrast with their own harmony and splendour. It was the lull which precedes the storm. Their own doom was sealed. "THE INTERESTS OF THE ROYAL ACADEMY" demand that the proof of former delinquency be reduced *by reducing the means of comparison*. The merits of that "select aristocracy of merit"§ might shine with more lustre if the merits of the Great Masters were less obtrusive. The dread fiat goes forth "to restore" them. At last, in the vacation of 1852, Sir C. Eastlake and Messrs. Russell and Uwins consummate that long concerted wholesale desecration which roused the Public to exact from the House of Commons that inquiry out of which have grown A MOCK REPORT and this PROTEST AND COUNTER-STATEMENT.||

\* Min. of Sel. Com. on Nat. Gal. of 1850, Uwins's Evid. 106.

† Sir C. Eastlake kept up a connection with the Gallery on the pretext of revising the future articles for the Catalogue.

‡ Russell's Evid. 4826-31.

§ Prince Albert's Speech at the Royal Academy Dinner.—*Times*, May 5th, 1851.

|| The Blue Book contains 965 folio pages. There are 10,410 questions and answers, and 22 Appendices.

# PROTEST AND COUNTER-STATEMENT

AGAINST THE

## Report of the Select Committee

ON THE

## NATIONAL GALLERY.

---

*N.B. Except where the name of another document is stated, the marginal numbers refer throughout the Protest, to the questions and answers in the Parliamentary Blue Book entitled, "Report from the Select Committee on the National Gallery, &c." Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, 4th August, 1853.*

---

WE, the Undersigned, impressed with the importance of an efficient administration in our public Museums, both as a means for cultivating the more intellectual departments of Art, and as the surest foundation for improvement in the design of our manufactures, feel called upon to PROTEST publicly against the Report issued by the Select Committee appointed by the House of Commons, in the Session of 1853, to inquire into the Management of the National Gallery.

We PROTEST against the Report, because, instead of being a faithful exponent of the evidence received by the Committee, it perverts and misrepresents it.

The Report is therefore of a nature to destroy public confidence in Parliamentary Committees, and to lower the character of the Legislature.

We consider it due to the interests of Art, and to the credit of the Nation, that such a document should not remain unchallenged.

The subjects which had chiefly arrested public atten-



tion, as most directly and forcibly illustrating the past management of the Gallery, were the purchasing and the cleaning of pictures: but the allegations against the picture-cleaning of 1852, were the immediate cause of the appointment of the Committee.

### THE PURCHASING OF PICTURES.

With regard to the purchasing of pictures, although one of the questions the Committee were especially appointed to investigate, and upon which they were therefore bound to report, they are all but silent. At the same time, they have not failed to impress upon us, that “picture-purchasing is generally admitted to be the most “important duty attached to the management, in whatever “way it may be constituted, and the one involving the “greatest amount of responsibility.”

We PROTEST against this evasion of the subject of past purchases, since the Committee, at the time they drew up their Report, possessed conclusive evidence, not only that large sums of the public money had been wasted on bad and spurious works, but that even the senseless extravagance had more than once been committed, of first refusing, and afterwards purchasing, the same objectionable picture, at more than double the price originally demanded for it; while works of the greatest epochs of art, and of the highest excellence, were overlooked and rejected, although obtainable at a much smaller outlay.

But this evasion acquires a still greater significance, from the circumstance that the Chairman and Lord Elcho (Mr. Charteris), first individually, and then the former in the name of the Committee, exerted persuasion and

Report,  
p. xvi.

9954, 9806,  
9755, 9952,  
9754, 5640,  
5641, 5644,  
5649, 5658,  
5664, 5673,  
&c.



remonstrance to induce the principal witness to abstain from giving his evidence on this very subject of the Purchases; and that when in consequence of his earnest request, the Committee at last consented to receive it, he was plainly given to understand that he might expect from them every discouragement during his examination,—which he in fact experienced,—although it was their duty to afford him, as the originator of the charges against the Managers of the National Gallery, every facility for giving the fullest explanation on the subject.

*Morn. Post,*  
Nov. 9th, and  
15th, and  
Dec. 3rd;  
*Daily News,*  
Dec. 3rd,  
1853.

We will now proceed to give an analysis of the evidence upon the cleaning of the nine pictures in the vacation of 1852.

## THE PICTURE-CLEANING OF 1852.

### THE QUEEN OF SHEBA.—*Claude.*

The witnesses selected by the Committee as competent to judge of the operation performed on Claude's 'Queen of Sheba,' were *thirty* in number. Of these, *twenty-six* condemned it; a large majority declaring, that by the removal of the glazing "the warm "rich glow, brilliancy, sunny character, delicate tints, "gradations, aerial perspective, &c." of this picture had been destroyed; several of them, that the inscription at the bottom of the building in the right hand corner had been partly obliterated; some, that the operation had been most recklessly performed in regard to *time*, since "the six weeks' vacation, in which the cleaning of "the *nine* pictures was accomplished, ought to have

3370, 3889,  
3368, 3062,  
1623, 2666,  
&c.  
1796, 2105,  
3070, 5592,  
&c.

1681, &c.

1497. "been devoted to the 'Sheba' alone," &c.;\* while the President of the Royal Academy himself, the professional Trustee, and therefore the party most deeply implicated, admitted that this picture had been at least "ill and *tastelessly* cleaned." These *twenty-six* witnesses include Mr. Dyce, R. A., who is "disposed," he says, "to attribute the present aspect of the 'Sheba' to "more than the mere removal of dirty varnish." But this Professor of the Fine Arts likewise informs us, that he does "not know whether the peculiar glow, or "glisten, about this picture, before it was cleaned," which he "liked"—"whether a certain glistening in the "sky, a sort of *brown* light that flickered about the sun," which he even "admired"—was "the result of accident, "or of discolouration, or partly of original painting, or "the effect of time, or whether it was wholly *caused by dirt*;" and that therefore, he "cannot take upon "himself to decide whether the picture has, or has "not suffered by the removal of the effect he admired."
- Eastlake's Evid. 4590, 4592.
- Dyce's Evid. 4269.
- 3781, 3789, 3793, 3795, &c.
- 3794-8.

- \* The aggregate area of the nine pictures contains upwards of two hundred and sixteen square feet. The annual vacation within which they were cleaned, lasts six weeks. Mr. Segulier states that he, with an assistant, named Smart, worked at the cleaning six hours a day; which gives a total of two hundred and sixteen hours. Therefore Messrs. Segulier and Smart cleaned by solvents and friction, *upwards of a square foot an hour for six consecutive weeks*. But this is not all. They even found time to spare. Besides cleaning the nine pictures, they washed and varnished three of the largest paintings in the Gallery; namely, 'The Raising of Lazarus,' the Parmigiano, and 'The Holy Family,' by Murillo, whose united surface measures more than two hundred and forty-one square feet. Well might one of the witnesses complain that the National pictures had been treated as "a mechanic," not as "a man of Art" would have treated them.
- 671.
- 672-6.
- 679.
- 1681.



He says moreover, that though he "can say he had an  
 "adequate acquaintance with the 'Sheba' before the 3775.  
 "last cleaning," he is nevertheless both "sorry that his  
 "acquaintance with it was not *sufficiently* accurate, and  
 "afraid that his recollection of it is not strong enough, 3741, 3749,  
 "to enable him to say whether it was an injured or an 3794, 3805,  
 "uninjured picture, or to speak to its present state 4283.  
 "and condition, or to determine what injury has been  
 "recently done." When examined by the Committee a  
 second time however, he had learned to "believe that in 4280.  
 "parts the 'Sheba' is injured to the extent of the  
 "original work of the master being rubbed off."

Of the four remaining witnesses, three, namely, Messrs.  
 Russell a Trustee, Uwins, R. A. the Keeper, and Seguiet  
 the Cleaner, had either authorized, superintended, or per-  
 formed the operation. Their credit therefore was at  
 stake; which Messrs. Russell and Uwins vindicate, the  
 first, by saying that "the 'Sheba,'—though he has no 4915.  
 "knowledge he could ask the Committee to rely on—is 4898.  
 "much improved," but that, "of course, Sir C. Eastlake's  
 "opinion," which is that it has been *ill and tastelessly* 4590-2.  
*cleaned*, "must be very much better than his own;" the 4841.  
 last, by declaring that "the cleaning of the 'Sheba'  
 "was done with wonderful address indeed, and that it 322.  
 "is now much more beautiful, much more pleasing, more 323.  
 "effective, more real, and much more likely to meet the  
 "feelings of *humanity* generally." The charge that  
 glazings have been removed, Mr. Uwins summarily 4881 0021  
 disposes of, by protesting that he did "not admit those 117, 118.  
 "glazings, as they are called;" and by boldly denouncing  
 them, as "*quite a modern English quackery*, that has 116.  
 "nothing to do with the noble works in the remote ages



119. "of art:" "it is only the *English* painters," he affirms, "who adopt them." These opinions he "maintains, "because he has painted pictures before Mr. Morris "Moore was *born*, and copied pictures from Rubens, 2792. "Titian, Paul Veronese, and Correggio, that *will com-* "pare," he assures us, "*with the originals*"—he "used "no glazing there"—he "*purposely* avoided it; and "that," he says, "has proved to his mind that he was "correct." The fourth was Mr. Bolton, a picture-cleaner, who however confirms the charge that part of 1031. the inscription has "been rubbed out."

Consequently, *but for one exception*, if Mr. Bolton be one, the uncompromised witnesses were unanimous against the cleaning of the 'Queen of Sheba.'

#### THE ISAAC AND REBECCA.—*Claude*.

- The witnesses examined as to the result of the operation on Claude's 'Marriage of Isaac and Rebecca,' were *twenty-three* in number. *Eighteen* condemned it 1340, 4077, as exceedingly injurious; alleging, that "the glazings 3424, 3494, "had been removed;" that the picture had been &c. "over-rubbed;" that there was "a rawness and want of "tone in it very disagreeable;" &c. Only five palliated it; namely, the same three compromised parties who approve of the cleaning of the preceding picture, the President of the Royal Academy, and Mr. Bentley, a 1800, 1884. picture-cleaner, who nevertheless considers, that "a "trifle of the original texture has been taken off," and who condemns the cleaning of the 'Sheba;' while 1042. Mr. Bolton who supports that, "found" the 'Isaac and Rebecca,' "very raw indeed—very crude—the

“*crudest of the whole.*” Mr. Uwins is of opinion that  
 “*if the glazing has been removed from the ‘Rebecca,’ a*  
 “work he really venerates, knows, and loves, it is very 67.  
 “*much for the benefit of the picture.*” 3174.

Here again, in the case of the ‘Isaac and Rebecca,’ the uncompromised witnesses, *but for one exception*, if Mr. Bentley be one, are unanimous against the cleaning.

#### THE ANNUNCIATION.—*Claude.*

The witnesses who gave evidence upon the cleaning of Claude’s ‘Annunciation,’ were likewise *twenty-three* in number. Of these, *eighteen* condemned it. Among them was Lord Monteagle, a Trustee, who had known this picture when in Sir George Beaumont’s possession. Lord Monteagle “admits” that he “loved that Claude 5072, 5085.  
 “better in its former state than now,” and that “the  
 “change in it is painful to his eye;” while Sir C. Eastlake, the President of the Royal Academy, virtually confessed that in this case also, as in that of the ‘Sheba,’ the cleaning was not entirely satisfactory, by suggesting that  
 “the picture of the ‘Annunciation’ *would be much*  
 “*improved if you were to take a little dust and rub over*  
 “*it; as that would do great good, much greater good, than*  
 “*attempting to restore the softness of outlines which may* Eastlake’s  
 “*have been destroyed in some of the pictures by over-* Evid. 4723,  
 “*cleaning;”*\* and by “recommending that it should be 4592, 4724,  
 “left without its glass, for *at least* a twelvemonth, so &c.  
 “that it might have *the benefit of dirt;*” which, he says,

\* It should not be forgotten that Sir C. Eastlake, in spite of his conviction that the pictures had been damaged, which he betrays in the admissions above quoted, and in others, such as—“The lights in



4508. "has the effect of glazing, and is quite as good some-  
 4725. "times, as it agreeably diversifies the regularity of the  
 forms," restores "the broken irregularity of touch," and  
 gives "gusto;" an "opinion from which," Mr. William  
 4912. Russell "begs, *with all respect* to Sir Charles Eastlake,  
 "to express his entire dissent." The five remaining wit-  
 nesses were three of the compromised parties before men-  
 tioned, and the *same* picture-cleaners, Messrs. Bentley  
 and Bolton, this time in agreement. Mr. Bentley  
 1885. who "draws a distinction between *substantial damage*  
 "to the texture of a picture, and injury to the mere  
 "general effect, by leaving bare the raw colour of the  
 1916. "paint," says that "the 'Annunciation' seems to have  
 "been very nicely cleaned:" but each of these gen-  
 tlemen somewhat qualifies his approbation; the former,  
 1800-84. by stating that "a trifle of the *original texture*" has  
 been removed from *all* the nine pictures; the latter,  
 1050. that he "prefers cleaning not quite so low down as  
 "that;" while to Mr. Uwins "it appears that the  
 3202. "'Annunciation' now displays all the beautiful and  
 "delicate qualities for which Claude was renowned;"
- 
4583. "the 'View of Venice' have been *too much* cleaned," and in the fol-  
 lowing preposterous contradiction; "I am not prepared to say that  
 Eastlake's  
 Evid. 4586. "anything has been removed, *but still I say the cleaning has been*  
 "carried too far, and that cleaning at all was unnecessary," had agreed  
 to the Resolution passed by the Trustees on the 12th of November  
 1853, before any public animadversions had been made upon the  
 cleaning. That Resolution is as follows: "Resolved, that the Trus-  
 Russell's  
 Evid. 4837. "tees approve of the result of the instructions on this head, *as evinced*  
 "in the improved appearance of the pictures, and of the manner in  
 "which the operations have been performed by Mr. Seguer under the  
 "superintendence of Mr. Uwins."



he "cannot discern any damages, *nor does he believe* 3203.  
*"that anybody else can."*

The uncompromised witnesses who condemned the cleaning of the 'Annunciation,' were *eighteen against two*.

#### A VIEW IN VENICE.—*Canaletto*.

The witnesses examined upon the cleaning of Canaletto's 'View in Venice,' were *twenty-two* in number. Of these, *seventeen* pronounced it extremely injured; one affirming, that "the genial and pleasant warmth 4136.  
 "which belonged to it was very much damaged;" a second, that "the distinctive attributes of the master 3263.  
 "were gone;" a third, that "the relief had been abso- 3063.  
 "lutely destroyed;" others, that it was "raw," "much 2616, 3434.  
 "rubbed," &c.; even the President of the Royal Academy finding it expedient to acknowledge that "the lights  
 "had been too much cleaned," and that he was "sure 4583, 4585.  
 "those lights would be better for glazing *now*;" while Mr. David Roberts, R. A., a colleague of Sir C. Eastlake and of Mr. Uwins, after telling us that he "knew this picture well, having studied it for years at the Gallery," 3495-8.  
 emphatically declared that the "scumblings, and even the  
 "paint, had been removed, so much so as to destroy the  
 "whole harmony of the picture;" that the "mason's shed 3496.  
 "had been scrubbed to such an extent, that the paint  
 "had been taken off altogether,"—which even Mr. Stanfield R.A., another colleague of Mr. Uwins, "who re- 3603, 3605.  
 "members the shed very well," partly confirms,—"that it  
 "was now all raw and disjointed;" that "nothing can 3508, 3509,  
 "ever remedy this Canaletto;" that even "if you were &c.  
 "to cover it again with brown varnish, *that* would never

3498. "bring it back to what it was;" that it was "DONE FOR:"—that he "should say *most distinctly* that features "which he remembered formerly, had been removed by "*the late cleaning*;" and that he was "very much "shocked indeed, at seeing the great alteration that had "taken place." Again, the five excusing witnesses were Messrs. Uwins, William Russell, and Seguiet, and the *same* picture-cleaners, Messrs. Bolton and Bentley. Mr.
3175. Uwins says, that "*not one of the deficiencies* mentioned first by Mr. Morris Moore," and subsequently by Mr. Roberts, R.A., "has he been able to perceive;" that "he
3176. "sees no difference in the distinctness of the mason's shed, "as compared with its appearance before the cleaning, no
3177. "effacing *anywhere, nor anything that approaches to it*;" "but that all the traits are as perfect as possible, and to "*his* eye look just like the original touch of the master."

The uncompromised witnesses adverse to the cleaning of 'a View in Venice,' were *seventeen against two*.

#### A VIEW ON THE GRAND CANAL.—Canaletto.

- The witnesses questioned upon the cleaning of the other picture by Canaletto, 'A view on the Grand Canal,' were *twenty-one* in number: the censors of the cleaning numbered *fourteen*. These declared that the picture had been "deprived of its glazing;" that it
4077. was "raw," "discordant;" that it had "suffered
- 2616, 3547, 4294, &c. "extremely;" &c. The seven apologists for it were the same five as for the preceding picture, Sir C. Eastlake, P. R. A., and Mr. Stanfield, R. A., who, though he tends his evidence on old pictures, says that his "experi-
3594. "ence of old pictures is very slight." Mr. Uwins, when



requested by the Chairman to state what observations he had to make in reference to Mr. Morris Moore's remarks upon this picture, meets the charge, that "the perspective of the water had been injured," by saying ; "now really Canaletto's mode of painting water was so absurd, that if it was *all rubbed out*, it would be *so* 3180. *much the better.*"

The uncompromised witnesses numbered in condemnation of the cleaning of 'A View on the Grand Canal' *fourteen against three.*

#### THE CONVERSION OF ST. BAVON.—*Rubens.*

The witnesses examined upon the 'St. Bavon,' by Rubens, were *twenty-two* in number. Of these, *eighteen* were against the cleaning; some affirming that it was "raw," "very impoverished, meagre and discordant;" 3547. others, that the "body-paint had been scrubbed up;" 4083. while Mr. Roberts, the same Royal Academician who so energetically denounced the injuries inflicted on Canaletto's 'View in Venice,' declared that it seemed to him "a *frightful alteration from what it was before*;" and that as to "the harmony and tone of the picture, the 3499. " 'St. Bavon' was *destroyed.*" The four approving witnesses were three of the four compromised parties already named, and Mr. Bolton, the picture-cleaner, who thinks the "cleaning of this picture is very good;" 1046. while Mr. Uwins "can see no deficiencies in it *whatever*," "every part being just in the *same* state in which it *was.*" 3204.

The uncompromised witnesses hostile to the result of the cleaning were, in the case of the 'St. Bavon' also, *all but unanimous.*

THE CONSECRATION OF ST. NICHOLAS.—*P. Veronese.*

The witnesses who gave judgment on the cleaning of the 'Consecration of St. Nicholas,' by Paul Veronese, were *twenty-one* in number. *Fifteen* were adverse to it; Sir Edwin Landseer, another colleague of Sir C. Eastlake and of Mr. Uwins, declaring that "the Paul Veronese had "here and there, been a little *tortured*"—that he "must "say *that*, speaking *candidly*;" others pronouncing that "the markings which described the forms of the "various objects had been absolutely taken away;" that "it was crude, cold, and had lost a great deal of its "mellowness;" that "the whole of the master's glazing "had been removed;" that "in parts it had been *com-* 3524, 1037, 4078, &c. *pletely flayed*; that its effect was destroyed; that it 3059. "was irrecoverable;" &c. The six witnesses favourable to the operation, comprise the four implicated parties already named, and Messrs. Bromley and Dennistoun. The importance of the last-named gentleman's opinion is considerably modified by his declaration, that when he says "too much" has been "taken from a picture," he. "probably" means "a portion of the original 3374, 3400. "master's touch;" but "*that* being a technical point," and his "technical knowledge not being sufficiently "matured to speak to that," he is unable to determine whether, by this expression, he does mean the original master's touch or not. Mr. Uwins declares that the Paul Veronese, from being "entirely lost, so that 32. "nobody could form any conception of it, is now restored 3172. "to its pristine beauty; that the colours now come out "in all their splendour and glory; that in its present



“state it is something real—almost beyond reality— 3161, 3169.  
 “*divine*; that one would almost feel inclined to fall  
 “down and *worship it*.”

The uncompromised witnesses counted *fifteen against two*, condemnatory of the cleaning of the ‘Consecration of St. Nicholas.’

#### ANGELS WEeping OVER CHRIST.—*Guercino*.

The witnesses questioned as to the altered state of the ‘Angels weeping over Christ,’ by Guercino, were *sixteen* in number; *ten* of them declaring against the cleaning, 3067, 3288, as having considerably damaged it. The six witnesses 4082, 4293, &c. favourable to it were Mr. Bolton, who nevertheless, thinks it “rather raw,” Mr. Stanfield, R. A., and as 1051. usual, the same four implicated parties; Mr. Uwins having “looked for any injury to it, in vain.” 3201.

The uncompromised witnesses who pronounced against the cleaning of the ‘Angels weeping over Christ,’ were *ten against two*.

#### THE PLAGUE AT ASHDOD.—*N. Poussin*.

The witnesses examined upon the ‘Plague at Ashdod,’ by Nicholas Poussin, were *sixteen* in number: *thirteen* of them being against, only three in favour of the cleaning.

The uncompromised witnesses declared *unanimously* 1028, 1405, that this picture had suffered extremely; the Keeper 4078, 3067, who had superintended the operation, which, according 5561, &c. to him, “has not at all altered its “condition,” the 3185. cleaner who had performed it, and Mr. William Russell, who with his fellow Trustee, Sir C. Eastlake,

had been the most active in promoting it, alone maintaining the contrary.

From the preceding analysis it will be found, that of one hundred and ninety-four decisions delivered before the Committee, on the cleaning of the nine pictures, *one hundred and forty-nine* were condemnatory of their altered appearance—*only forty-five* in favour of it; and that of the latter, *thirty-one* are but the *multiplied self-approvals* of Messrs. Segquier, Uwins, R.A., William Russell, and Sir C. Eastlake, *parties impeached*. If we deduct their evidence, and that of Mr. Morris Moore, the originator of the charges against the cleaning, we have the still more formidable contrast of *one hundred and forty, against fourteen*; a clear majority of ONE HUNDRED AND TWENTY-SIX,—TEN TO ONE IN SUPPORT OF THE CHARGES.

Besides the witnesses examined before the Committee, the Chairman requested four persons to send him, in writing, their opinions upon the state of the nine pictures. Of these, Mr. Leslie, R. A., is the only one who ventures to express himself in favour of their altered appearance. He even intimates that all are “ignorant,” who maintain that they have been damaged; and therefore includes in his sweeping egotism, his own colleagues, Roberts, Hart, Dyce, Stanfield, Landseer, and Eastlake. He has “no hesitation in saying, that “the ‘Consecration of St. Nicholas’, by Paul Veronese, and the Claudes have been restored, as nearly “as possible, to their original condition:” the only picture respecting which he does “not feel so confident,” is the ‘St. Bavon,’ by Rubens. But we trust

Russell's  
Evid. 4837.

Leslie's  
Letter,  
Appendix  
No. XIII,  
p. 782.



there is yet in England a sufficient appreciation of the Great in Art, to treat with the contempt it deserves, the authority of one who, from the Chair of Reynolds, as Professor of Painting at the Royal Academy, while he singles for hostile criticism Raphael's celebrated design, 'The Massacre of the Innocents,'\* and the 'Resurrection of Lazarus,' by Sebastiano del Piombo, indoctrinates students with the notion, that "Etty often "rivals Rubens and the Great Venetians on their own "ground, and has, *moreover, developed power peculiar to "himself;*" and that *no painter ever surpassed him, in purity and expression.* The three other correspondents of the Chairman pronounced the cleaned pictures extremely damaged; Mr. Buchanan, formerly the proprietor of several of them, declaring that "the 'St. Bavon' was "ruined;" that "the original glazings and finishings were "gone from the 'Plague at Ashdod';" that "the glazings "had been entirely swept away from the Paul Veronese, "which had been thrown outrageously out of harmony;" and that "the gradations of rich and warm colours "in Claude's 'Sheba,' had been washed away down to "the very ground-paint."

Leslie's  
Lec., *Athenæum*, Feb.  
26th, 1848.

Leslie's  
Lec., *Athenæum*, March  
30th, 1848.

Appendix  
Nos. XIV  
and XV.

Appendix  
No. XI,  
pp. 769,  
770, and  
771.

Notwithstanding such overwhelming evidence to guide them, and in spite of their ready assumption of the highest attribute of the connoisseur,—for they decide who are "eminent" as artists, and who "well qualified" to judge of works of art,—the Committee altogether evade pronouncing an opinion on the late picture-cleaning.

Report,  
pp. ix and xi.

We PROTEST against this evasion of delivering judgment upon a question which so vast a preponderance of evidence placed beyond a doubt.

---

\* The one engraved by Marc' Antonio.

But there are other grounds of complaint against the Committee.

At page viii of the Report, the Committee state that "the picture-cleaning in the autumn of 1846, attracted "some notice, and was severely condemned by Mr. Morris "Moore;" by which, together with what follows at page x, we are to understand that no one else had condemned it *as severely*; an obvious insinuation that his animadversions were exaggerated. This insinuation the Committee make in defiance of the printed evidence in their hands to remind them, that out of the *fourteen* uncompromised witnesses whom they reluctantly allowed to refer to the operations of 1846,—for the Committee had announced a determination to avoid that question, and to limit their inquiry strictly to the recent picture-cleaning,—TEN, that is, more than TWO TO ONE, had confirmed Mr. Morris Moore's charges against the cleaning of that year, in terms *as severe* as those in which they were uttered.

The following is a summary of the evidence on the cleaning of the four pictures in 1846.

#### THE PICTURE-CLEANING OF 1846.

The four pictures cleaned in 1846, were 'the Peace and War,' by Rubens, 'The Boar Hunt,' by Velazquez, 'The Bacchus and Ariadne,' by Titian, and 'A Landscape with Cattle and Figures,' by Cuyp.

The TEN witnesses who condemned the cleaning declare that 'The Peace and War,' by Rubens, "has been very "much injured, thrown out of harmony, and the relative



“position of many of the objects in it altered; that all  
 “the warm colours in the flesh have been changed into  
 “cold colours, the beautiful greys forced into a gradation  
 “of blues or purples; that the original brilliancy and  
 “lustre are thereby materially impaired, and that it  
 “never will or *can* regain the glowing and rich effect  
 “it once possessed;” that “the Velazquez ‘Boar  
 “Hunt’ has lost its pleasing character, richness, and  
 “spirit;” that “it now looks heavy, wanting in air and  
 “distance,” and that “the injuries are owing to the process  
 “of cleaning to which it has been subjected at the Gal-  
 “lery:” that “all the pictures cleaned in 1846, the two  
 “above-mentioned, the ‘Bacchus and Ariadne,’ and the  
 “Cuypp, are strikingly crude, raw, very much rubbed,  
 “and generally out of tone, and out of harmony;” that  
 “they are just as much injured as those recently cleaned,  
 “and in the same way;” that “they have not recovered  
 “their lost qualities at all;” and that “*neither TIME nor*  
 “*DIRT can ever restore the beauty that is gone.*”

Buchanan,  
App. No. XI.

1428, 4041,  
3879, &c.

4337, 4338,  
4341.

3591, 3080,  
3919, 4345,  
&c.

To this evidence, though as severe as that of Mr.  
 Morris Moore, the Committee make not the slightest  
 allusion; but say, that “the effect produced on these  
 “pictures is still a matter of dispute;” in support of  
 which, they appeal exclusively to Mr. Bolton the picture-  
 cleaner, and for its confirmation, refer us to the follow-  
 ing unintelligible passage in his evidence:—

Report,  
p. ix.

1057. “Have you observed any peculiarity in the change  
 that has taken place in the pictures that were cleaned in  
 1846?—Yes; the Cuypp has now a mellowness over it; there  
 is not much oil in the varnish; the Rubens ‘Peace and War’  
 is a very harmonious and mellow piece; the Velazquez is

cold ; at present there is a great deal of chill upon it ; that has had mastic and oil on it, I think, since the oil varnish, or else I do not think it would chill so fast ; mastic varnish would chill quicker on a coat of oil varnish than on a coat of mastic varnish."

This is all that the Committee think worthy of notice in the evidence on the picture-cleaning of 1846.

Hart's Evid.  
3346, 3255,  
3294.

3307-8.

The four witnesses favourable to the operations of that year, were this same Mr. Bolton, Mr. Stanfield, R.A., Sir E. Landseer, R.A., and Mr. Solomon Hart, R.A., who "thinks there may be some little change," but that "*that* is merely a question of *opinion* ;" who, when asked whether the recently cleaned 'Sheba,' which he tells us, "reminds him now more of *Vernet* than of 'Claude,' will regain by *time* that which he says it has lost, "really cannot answer that question"—he "*hopes it may* ;" and, of course, has equal confidence that all Vernets will, *in time*, become Claudes.

But the attempt to mislead with respect to the picture-cleaning of 1846, does not end here.

Report, pp.  
viii and ix.

We are told that "the Trustees requested Sir C. Eastlake to report upon the subject," in reply to Mr. Morris Moore's charges ; that "in his Report annexed to the 'Minutes of 1846, he states his opinion that the results 'of those operations'—his *own*, be it remembered—"had been satisfactory ;" and that "he adds the testimony of distinguished artists, confirming his own 'opinion :'" "the letters of W. Mulready, W. Etty, "E. Landseer, C. Stanfield, *and other eminent artists*," add the Committee, "expressed *decided approbation* of "the cleaning, and declared that the effect of the pictures had been improved by the process."



The *first* of these artists, Mr. Mulready, limits himself to saying, that he has not "*discovered*" on the 'Bacchus and Ariadne,' the 'Peace and War,' or the Cuyp, the only pictures he mentions, "any appearance of injury *to the parts within his reach*;" which, what with the negative character of the "not discovered," and what with the qualified phrase, "the parts within reach," so far from being an expression of "decided approbation," is not even a denial that the pictures had been damaged.

Mulready's Letter, Min. of Trustees, 1845-6, Parl. Paper, 1847, p. 17.

Therefore, the Committee *have misrepresented* the testimony of this artist.

The *second*, Mr. Etty, speaks also of only three pictures, the 'Peace and War,' the 'Boar Hunt,' and the Cuyp. His inspection of the *three*, which unitedly present a surface of *more than a hundred and fifty four square feet*, occupied him *altogether*, he says, "*only about a quarter of an hour*." It is upon such an examination of such a surface, that he pronounces the pictures "*judiciously and admirably done*," and more especially the Rubens, which until then, he "confesses he could never thoroughly like, because he could not see it: its darkness, opacity, and heavy character, until it was thus cleaned, so contrary to the bland, general sunny and clear detail of Rubens, always made him at least indifferent to it:" yet every one who had written on this picture previous to its being cleaned, appears to have been at a loss for words to express his sense of its luminousness, transparency, and splendour.

Etty's Letter, Idem, pp. 17 and 18.

John Landseer's Catalogue of the Nat. Gal. &c.

The *third*, Sir Edwin Landseer, who, in 1847, writes to Sir C. Eastlake—"I should like you to say to Mr. Segquier from me, *how much obliged* to him I feel for

Landseer's Letter, Min. of Trustees, 1845-6 p. 18.

"his judicious cleaning, *which enables me to see the merits of the masters;*" in 1853, had so entirely forgotten his panegyric on the cleaning, and his *obligations to the cleaner*, that when asked by the Committee if he had given "a favourable opinion as to the result of the operations of 1846," all he could reply was; "Yes, I think I did; I have not a *copy* of it. Yes, I remember writing a note."

Stanfield's  
Letter, Min.  
of Trustees,  
1845-6, pp.  
18 & 19.

The *fourth*, Mr. Stanfield, appears to have founded his "decided approbation" of the cleaning of 1846, not so much on any opinion of his own, as on that "*full reliance which every painter in the Academy,*" he says, "*has in Mr. Segurier's judgment.*"

Report, p.  
viii.

Such is the "testimony" which the Committee quote as "confirming the opinion of Sir C. Eastlake."

But their utter absence of candour with regard to the cleaning of 1846, is still more strikingly exemplified by what follows. They state that, *besides* W. Mulready, W. Etty, E. Landseer, and C. Stanfield, "*other eminent artists* expressed decided approbation of the cleaning of 1846."

Report,  
pp. viii & ix.

The artists whose "testimony" Sir C. Eastlake adds to his Report were *only five* in number. The Committee name *four*. The *fifth* was MR. UWINS. Anonymously, he is "distinguished and eminent;" they even *multiply* his authority. Openly, they dare not so much as mention him. They therefore suppress the name of Uwins, and in defiance of Sir C. Eastlake's Report and the five artists' letters before them, do not scruple to insert in its stead; "*other eminent artists* expressed "decided approbation of the cleaning of 1846, and



“declared that the effect of the pictures had been  
“improved by the process.”

*The number* therefore of the artists who support Sir C. Eastlake, as given in the Report, *is false*.

We PROTEST against the above misrepresentation of the value and extent of the evidence favourable to the picture-cleaning of 1846, a misrepresentation which assumes a still more aggravated character from the total silence upon the evidence against it.

We resume the question of 1852-3.

The Committee next charge Mr. Morris Moore with being, “*now again*, the most vehement in his Report, p. x. “complaints;” and by way of giving to this charge some appearance of plausibility, certain expressions used by him in describing the treatment to which the National pictures had been subjected, are culled from an examination extending over many hundreds of questions, and thrown into juxtaposition, with the obvious intent to impart an air of exaggeration to his testimony, and thereby lessen its weight with the Public. “Mr. Morris Moore states,” says the Report, “that the original painting of the master has been Idem. “in many cases, removed, rubbed out, and that in one “case, an eye has been actually wiped away and obliterated by the process of the cleaner. Other pictures, “he says, have been flayed, scrubbed, and so irretrievably ruined, that whereas before they were in fine “condition, they are now offensive to the sight, and “deprived, not only of artistic beauty, but of commercial value.”

We PROTEST against this invidious picking out from the evidence of a particular witness, and parading in immediate sequence, the synonymous expressions, “re-  
“moved and rubbed out,” “actually wiped away and  
“obliterated,” “flayed, scrubbed, and ruined,” used by him, not in a torrent of tautological invective, as is made to appear in the Report, but to illustrate different points in his charges against the altered appearance of the pictures, which he had been summoned by the Committee to explain.

We PROTEST against this mode of representing evidence, as an act of *personal hostility* to the witness. This inference is supported by the suppression of the fact, that the very expressions so pointedly quoted as proof of his peculiar “vehemence,” were used, not only by the witnesses generally, as we have shown in the analysis of the evidence on the cleaning of the nine pictures, but actually by *six* of those *seven* “eminent artists and amateurs,” namely, Messrs. Evans, Fradelle, Hart, R. A., Dennistoun, Sir. T. Sebright, and Edward Cheney, to whom the Committee especially appeal, as “well  
“qualified, from having been long intimately acquainted  
“with the nine pictures, to pronounce a judgment on  
“their present condition;” and to whose “unprejudiced  
“opinions,” continues the Report, “*the Committee wish  
“to direct attention.*” Mr. Stanfield, the *seventh* of these  
witnesses, occasionally endorses the charges, but abstains  
from such emphatic expressions, from a sense, we hope,  
that they would ill become one who, as he informs us  
of himself, “cannot say that he is well acquainted with  
“the pictures in the Gallery;” and whose “experience of

Report,  
p. xi.

3601, 3603,  
3649, 3652,  
&c.

3594, 3630.



“the Old Masters, never having studied them minutely, “is very slight.”

These six umpires of the Committee's *own choice* affirm, and with truth, that all the nine pictures have suffered extremely; that, in several instances, “the original glazing of the master has been entirely removed;” that, in some, the very “body colour has been disturbed;” that, “great qualities have disappeared;” that, “characteristic traits and distinctive attributes are gone”—entirely gone; that, Claude has dissolved into Vernet; that, “the warm, rich glow, sunny effect, delicacy and transparency, harmony, gradations, and aerial perspective, which gave value and character, have been destroyed;” that, the pictures are now, “raw, crude, disagreeable to the eye, spotty, and rotten;” that, “the master's touch has been very much effaced;” that, “their surfaces have been greatly injured by “over-cleaning,” and “over-rubbing;” by having been “rubbed,” “much rubbed,” “too much rubbed,” “rubbed off,” “rather scrubbed,” “rubbed down so “as to have become confused;” that, one picture “is a destroyed picture;” that, “the damages are the effect of the recent cleaning;” that, the pictures can “never recover;” and that, “their commercial value has been very considerably diminished:” while even Mr. Stanfield admits “that there has been some removal of details from Canaletto's ‘View in Venice’—a picture “which he had studied and looked at frequently;” that, “certain objects in it are not so vigorous as he remembers them;” that, “*probably* he liked the ‘Sheba’ better “before it was cleaned, because he likes a toned picture;”

2327, 2339,  
2666, 3261,  
3263, 3255,  
3294, 3370,  
3368, 4302,  
3369, 2674,  
3422, 2616,  
3371, 3272,  
3376, 3262,  
4308, 4309,  
3434, 3427,  
4304, 4306,  
3435, 4298,  
3265, 2687,  
3308, 2688,  
&c.

3603, 3605.

3649.

3601. that "the tone of none of the pictures is so rich as it was," though "*he has not the least doubt that that will be restored in time:*" he adds, that when he previously "spoke of his
3628. "own *ignorance*, he did it only in reference to his not possessing the information that he knows many gentlemen "belonging to the *Academy* have:" he "should refer at
3789. "once to Mr. Dyce,"—the "eminent" R.A. who owns he cannot tell *dirt from original painting*,—"as a very great "authority, and also to Sir Charles Eastlake himself."\*

We PROTEST against no mention having been made in the Report, of the unequivocal condemnation passed upon the cleaning by the witnesses to whom the Committee especially refer, as "unprejudiced and well "qualified to pronounce a judgment on the subject."

Nor are the three umpires, out of the four chosen by the Committee to record their opinions in writing, less "vehement." They declare that the pictures have been "most fearfully scoured—violently treated;" that, "they have been thrown most outrageously out of "harmony," and are now "harsh, crude, disagreeable, "without luminousness, and offensive to the eye;" that, "glazings have been entirely destroyed, and that what "formerly receded, is now cast forward;" that, "the "fine sparkling and rich colours which formed the charm

Buchanan,  
App.No. XI,  
and App.  
Nos. XIV  
and XV.

---

\* 4736. Mr. Charteris.] Do you see signs of that *woodenness* which you say characterises Claude's pictures, in the 'St. Ursula'?

Sir C. Eastlake, P. R. A.] I can see it, but the dirt which is over it, conceals and breaks it.

4737. Mr. Charteris.] Do you imagine that that which breaks and conceals it, is the work of the painter or the effect of time and dirt?

Sir C. Eastlake, P. R. A.] I CANNOT TELL.



“ of the ‘ Sheba,’ have been washed away, leaving a blank  
“ in art on the surface of this once wonderful picture, which  
“ no living man can restore to its pristine state ;” that,  
“ the various gradations of rich, warm colours have been  
“ swept away, while that space which the glorious  
“ luminary held, has been washed down to the ground  
“ painting, or dead colours of the picture ;” that “ the sad  
“ change the ‘ Sheba ’ has undergone, *is a cruel loss to the*  
“ *National Gallery ;*” that, “ the pictures have been  
“ *flayed ;*” and that the effect of all the nine pictures  
has been “ ruined by *pretended cleaning*”—but real  
“ VANDALISM.”

But there is yet further confirmation of the charges against the picture-cleaning, neither less worthy of note, nor less emphatic, than any hitherto adduced.

Among the witnesses, whom in our analysis of the evidence on the nine pictures we have in each instance reckoned as opposed to the cleaning, no one is more conspicuous than Sir David Brewster, whether for his scientific attainments, or for the decided tone of his condemnation. But as his celebrity is intimately associated with the science of Optics, which expounds those laws of light and colour, whose violation in pictorial art entails a corresponding forfeiture of its claim to be considered as a faithful exponent of nature, the sole aim of genuine art—a science whose decisions on all matters relating to the representation of nature, must therefore be final—his evidence on the present subject possesses a peculiar value, and demands especial notice.

The following extracts from the evidence given by

Mr. Morris Moore in the National Gallery before the pictures, and from that of Sir David Brewster, with the passages bearing upon the same points in the evidence of each placed side by side, will show not only that Sir David Brewster entirely confirms Mr. Morris Moore's charges, but that in several instances, their comparisons and expressions are the same:—

## MR. MORRIS MOORE.

*May 6th and 10th, 1853.*

2116. The effect of the 'Sheba' is now *cold*, very different to that which it was *formerly*.

2120. *The lights on the waves are a great deal too raw.* In consequence of the removal of the *glazing*, *there is no longer the appearance of light upon them.*

2117-36. The effect of the water is now *cold*. The cleaning has *totally altered the appearance of the sea.*

2117. The sea instead of being in perspective, is now *perpendicular*.

2064. In parts of the 'Sheba,' the paint has a *rubbed* look, precisely such as would be produced by the application of a too powerful solvent.

2063. The very ground of the picture has been laid bare; not only the *glazing*, but *body-paint has been removed.*

## SIR DAVID BREWSTER.

*June 10th, 1853.*

5586. The 'Queen of Sheba' is *very cold*. I attribute this *to the effect of the cleaning—entirely so.*

5572-8 *The light upon the waves is now white.* Considering the position of the sun, the light reflected upon the waves *could certainly not be white, consistently with nature: it ought to have been yellow.*

5573. *The sea is too blue* in consequence of the yellow pigment having been removed; the removal of the yellow pigment *has converted the green into a blue.*

5573. The distant sea seems to me *more like a wall* than a receding sea.

5592. In a great many parts of the 'Sheba,' the paint has been *rubbed down* as if some hard material had been applied.

5573-92. *Part of the paint has been removed.* There is a small boat *almost obliterated.*



MR. MORRIS MOORE.

*May 6th and 10th, 1853.*

2131. No uniform lowering of the tone of a picture would restore the gradation: there might be an apparent amelioration to an unpractised eye, but there would be no real improvement: *the aerial perspective would remain as false as before.*

2097, 2565. There was a thin glazing over the whole picture. The last process of the greatest colourists was glazing.

2072. *A portion of the inscription, "La Reine de Saba va trouver Salomon," has been so rubbed, that a person not previously acquainted with it, would find extreme difficulty in deciphering it.*

2356. I affirm that *before the late cleaning*, the 'Sheba' substantially represented the characteristics of the master.

2077. *Time can never restore the 'Sheba.'*

2204. *The glazing has been almost entirely removed from the 'Rebecca' by the cleaning. The effect of the picture is now extremely offensive.*

SIR DAVID BREWSTER.

*June 10th, 1853.*

5561-74-6. I applied a "Claude Lorraine" glass (so called from its being of a yellow tint,) to the 'Sheba,' [*which uniformly lowered its tone*]. Of course this could not correct any error in the painting; but it restored the peculiar Claude character to the picture—as far as the yellow tint was concerned. *Of course it did not restore the perspective.*

5562. *I cannot doubt that there was a yellow pigment of some kind or other, put upon the picture previous to varnishing—all over the picture.*

5592. *I see that the INSCRIPTION [La Reine de Saba, &c.] has been almost obliterated.*

5591. I can state from my recollection of the 'Sheba' *before it was cleaned, that it had the same general character as Claude's other pictures.*

5577. *Neither TIME nor any discolouration of varnish will ever restore the 'Sheba.'*

5561. The 'Rebecca' does not possess the colour of such light as Claude gave to his pictures. The yellow tint which distinguishes the pictures of Claude *has been entirely removed from it by the cleaning;*

MR. MORRIS MOORE.

May 6th and 10th, 1853.

2221. A very great portion of the original glazing has been taken away from the 'Annunciation.'

2229. I consider the 'Cephalus and Procris,' (*a Pastoral Landscape with Figures No. 2, an uncleaned picture,*) to be in a very fine state.

2153-62. The whole of the glazing and portions of the body colour have been removed from the 'Plague at Ashdod.'

2037. *All the pictures have been injured by the cleaning.*

SIR DAVID BREWSTER.

June 10th, 1853.

*there is not the slightest trace of a general yellow tone in that picture.*

5571. I would say the same of the small landscape of Claude, the 'Annunciation.'

5564. I conceive the 'Cephalus and Procris,' (*a Pastoral Landscape with Figures, No. 2, an uncleaned picture,*) to be a perfect Claude.

5561. The picture of Poussin, the 'Plague at Ashdod,' is exceedingly injured: *the general tone and harmony of the picture is injured.*

5561. I HAVE BEEN VERY MUCH STRUCK WITH THE INJURY DONE TO ALL THESE PICTURES BY THE CLEANING.

5560-71, 5601. *I have examined these paintings with very great care. I saw them before they were cleaned, and I have examined them since. I have made it my business to study these and other pictures. MY OPINIONS ARE FOUNDED ON MY PREVIOUS KNOWLEDGE OF THE EXISTENCE OF COLOURS AND TONES IN THE PICTURES, WHICH ARE NOT THERE NOW, ON THE PRINCIPLES OF HARMONY OF COLOURING, AND ON OPTICAL OBSERVATIONS.*

To the evidence of Sir David Brewster the Committee make not so much as a passing allusion. But, with a magnanimous contempt for principles of harmony of



colouring and optical observations, they depose to Mr. Segulier's "long experience and professional ability, which "are acknowledged," they assure us, by a Lady, a Marquis, three Dukes, and the Master of the Household from Osborne, "who testify to the care "and skill with which Mr. Segulier has invariably "treated *their* pictures:" Mr. William Russell having, to quote his own words, "thought it very desirable—right "—very material—nay, satisfactory—to make a *pointed* "*inquiry of those personages*, for the Committee's own "guidance in determining a question upon which *their* "*own* powers of discrimination must certainly be limited." "Upon this *weight* of testimony," adds Mr. Russell, "*I think Mr. Segulier may safely rely.*"

Report, p. xi,  
and Russell's  
Evid. 4837.

We PROTEST against the obsequious deference shown by the Committee for these loose opinions of persons of rank, to the exclusion of the sterling evidence of Science, which becomes even still more offensive when we take into account, that the testimonials referred to were obtained solely at the pressing instance of Mr. William Russell, not "in justice to Mr. Segulier," as he avers, but to divert public attention from his own presumptuous instigation of the operations which led to such grievous results.

Idem.

We PROTEST against this servile attempt to dispose of a great public question, as an insult to the intelligence of the Country.

We PROTEST, moreover, against such documents as those extorted by the importunities of Mr. William Russell being paraded by the Committee as an argument in favour of the cleaning, while they leave unnoticed the spontaneous and earnest declaration of the Earl of

Onslow, that he would revoke his bequest of certain pictures to the Nation, should the result of the present inquiry not satisfy him, that an effectual stop would be put to the destructive treatment of the pictures at the National Gallery.\*

#### THE ROYAL ACADEMY, AND THE PICTURE-CLEANING OF 1852.

The Royal Academicians who gave evidence were eight in number; namely, Sir C. Eastlake and Mr.

2550.

\* Lord Onslow's letter is addressed to Mr. Morris Moore, in whose evidence it is published, Blue Book, page 146-7. It is as follows:—  
 "Richmond, 25th April, 1853. Sir,—Aware that a Committee is  
 "now sitting for the purpose of hearing evidence on the subject of the  
 "'cleaning of pictures at the National Gallery,' and being rather  
 "doubtful of any beneficial result accruing from its labours, I beg (in  
 "connexion with what passed between us at the National Gallery,  
 "some three or four months ago, as to my having, by a codicil to my  
 "will, withdrawn my unrestricted bequest of certain pictures to that  
 "institution, for the express purpose of leaving them *conditionally*, and  
 "under very strict limitations as to the 'cleaning process'), to state  
 "that should my apprehensions be realised, and the same latitude left  
 "to the officials in Trafalgar Square, which they now misuse, of abso-  
 "lutely ruining the pictures by the destructive means resorted to, for  
 "what they deem 'restoration,' I would on the first proof of abuse of  
 "their vested powers, after the close of the Committee, most undoubtedly  
 "revoke my bequest to the National Gallery, and leave my pictures to  
 "the British Museum or some other public body, should they be  
 "deemed worthy of acceptance. If the 'flaying' of the paintings (I  
 "use the term 'flaying' in no hyperbolical sense) be persevered in at  
 "the National Gallery, it would operate, I should think, as a serious  
 "bar to the presentation and future bequest of pictures to that estab-  
 "lishment. Believe me to be your faithful servant, *Onslow*. Directed,  
 "Morris Moore, Esq., 27, Soho Square."

Lord Onslow has since marked his sense of the result of the inquiry, *by revoking his bequest*.



Uwins, the principals in the cleaning, and Messrs. Hart, Roberts, Stanfield, Dyce, Leslie, and Sir E. Landseer. We have already quoted some of their opinions. From what follows, the Public will have more direct means of ascertaining the value they should attach to the Royal Academy, *as a School of Art.*

What Mr. Hart affirms "to have been very beautiful, and not to  
"have required cleaning," Mr. Stanfield declares "to have certainly  
"stood much in need of it."

Where Mr. Roberts is "very much shocked indeed by objects  
"scrubbed to such an extent, that the paint has been taken off alto-  
"gether;" where Sir E. Landseer finds "the genial and pleasant  
"warmth has been very much damaged;" where even Mr. Stanfield,  
with "*the fullest reliance on Mr. Segquier's judgment,*" thinks "there  
"has been some removal of detail;" there, Sir C. Eastlake and Mr.  
Uwins "can see no injury, no effacing anywhere, nor anything that  
"approaches to it." Again, where Mr. Roberts finds "a frightful  
"alteration—destruction of harmony and tone;" where even Mr.  
Leslie, that confident champion of the cleaning, feels so little "con-  
"fident," as to be suddenly reminded "*that pictures are often ruined*  
"*by injudicious cleaning;*" there, Sir C. Eastlake and Mr. Uwins still  
"can see no injury, no change whatever."

What Sir E. Landseer pronounces "less harmonious, less agreeable  
"in its gradations, and *a little tyrannical now;*"\* what Sir C. Eastlake  
himself admits to have been "ill and tastelessly cleaned, and *could not*  
"*positively say that time will restore;*" Mr. Leslie declares "to have

---

\* Sir E. Landseer offers the following absurdities in palliation of the injuries he admits to have been inflicted on the National pictures by his colleagues, Eastlake and Uwins:—"You must remember," he says, "that if you have been accustomed to see a face always of the  
"same hue, and that face is suddenly *washed*, you would say perhaps  
"that it had been *injured*; you might say *if you washed a chimney-sweep*, that he had been *injured*."

323. "been restored as nearly as possible to its original condition;" Mr. Uwins, that it is now "much more effective and beautiful."

3255, 3294. What Mr. Solomon Hart declares to have so lost the character of the master, by "the removal of its surface," as to be now "more like the work of another;" what therefore, on his own showing, *must* have been deprived of some portion of *its original paint*; the same Mr. Solomon Hart "really cannot say may not regain" that paint—"in time."\*

4586. Where Sir C. Eastlake maintains "that *none of the master's work has been removed*;" there, the same Sir C. Eastlake protests that "*the cleaning has been carried too far*."

3694-5. What Mr. Stanfield finds "now disagreeable and raw, but does not believe to have been so *when it left the master's easel*;" the same Mr. Stanfield "thinks still very nearly *as the master left it*." Again, what 3697. Mr. Stanfield declares to have been deprived of its richness and tone—3601. for which he "thinks the master was *remarkable*;" what he "*probably* liked better with that richness of tone, *because he is fond of a* 3645. 3649. "*deep-toned picture*;" the same Mr. Stanfield pronounces "certainly 3657, 3720. "benefited," in spite of the loss of that richness of tone of which he professes to have been "fond."

4739. What Sir C. Eastlake "considers not injured," Mr. Dyce "con- 4280. sidered injured to the extent of the original work of the master being rubbed off."

4135. Where Sir E. Landseer sees signs of "torture," there, Mr. Uwins 3169. "almost feels inclined to fall down and worship."

What both Messrs. Stanfield and Roberts, after pronouncing it

---

\* "Notwithstanding the deep-rooted notion, even amongst the majority of painters themselves, that TIME is a great improver of good pictures, *nothing can be more absurd*."—HOGARTH.

"TIME cannot give a picture more union and harmony than has been in the power of a skilful master, with all his rules of Art to do."—HOGARTH.



extremely injured—"done for"—affirm that they had "frequently 3496, 3508.  
 "looked at and studied for years at the Gallery," and declare most 3603, 3498.  
 positively that they "*remember very well*;" Sir C. Eastlake, "does not 4588.  
 "remember himself, *nor does he believe that any other person can.*"

What Mr. Uwins declares "to have been *disfigured* by dirt," but now  
 that the dirt has been removed, "so beautiful that *nothing is wanting*;" 3202.  
 Sir C. Eastlake P. R. A. insists, "*does very much want some of that* 4592.  
*dirt it had before*; that it should be exposed to *dirt*—rubbed over  
 "with *dirt*;" for "*dirt*," he contends, gives "*gusto*," &c. 4723-5.

We have given but a sample of the contradictions of each other and of themselves, with which the evidence of these privileged Professors of Art abounds; of that combination of admission, evasion, and denial, on which the Committee build their pretext of "great contrariety of Report, p. x.  
 "judgment—irreconcilable differences of *taste*—con-  
 "flicting opinions," &c., for evading to pronounce a decided condemnation of the cleaning. These Royal Academicians, nevertheless, in the aggregate, *admit that all the nine pictures have been damaged.*

#### AGAINST THE CLEANING.

*Sheba*.—Hart, Dyce, Landseer, Eastlake.

*Isaac and Rebecca*.—Hart, Roberts, Landseer.

*Annunciation*.—Dyce, Landseer, Eastlake.

*View in Venice*.—Roberts, Landseer, Stanfield, Eastlake.

*View on the Grand Canal*.—Hart, Roberts, Landseer.

*St. Bavon*.—Hart, Roberts.

*P. Veronese*.—Hart, Landseer.

*Guercino*.—Hart, Landseer.

*N. Poussin*.—Hart, Eastlake.\*

---

\* Where any of these eight Academicians are not named as against the cleaning, they either spoke in favour of the cleaning of the pictures from which their names are omitted, or offered no evidence at all, or

It should be borne in mind that no Royal Academician gave any public expression to his opinions on the cleaning until the Committee met. For nearly *five months* had the public ear been ringing with denunciations against the damages inflicted on the National pictures, yet not a sound issued from the Royal Academy; although the only plea for *the existence of their Society* is, that they should be foremost in vigilance and zeal for the protection and advancement of Art. They even allowed a statement to circulate in the public Journals uncontradicted, that they were *unanimous in favour of the cleaning*. Hazlitt, an author Sir C. Eastlake quoted with such emphasis to the Committee, says that a Society established for the encouragement and promotion of Art has no right to exist at all, from the moment that it exists "only in wrong of Art, by the suppression of the "knowledge of Art,—in contempt of genius in Art,—in "defiance of all manly and liberal sentiment in Art." In the same page he says; "The Royal Academy are a "Society of hucksters in the fine Arts, who are more "tenacious of their profits as chapmen and dealers, than "of the honour of Art."

Hazlitt on  
the Catal.  
Raisonné of  
the British  
Inst.—"*Cri-  
ticisms on  
Art*," p.102.

What deeper wrong to Art,—what more flagrant suppression of the knowledge of Art, than the destruction of her Masterpieces? What greater contempt for genius in Art, and disregard of the honour of Art—*what greater defiance of all manly and liberal sentiment*, than to stand by without so much as a

---

gave their evidence *so evasively*, that we must refer those who are curious to guess what these Professors of Art *thought*, to the Blue Book.



word of expostulation, knowing, as these Royal Academicians *now confess they knew*, that many noble works of Art had been irreparably injured? What though the damages were inflicted by their own colleagues? Are the interests of Civilization to be betrayed that the incapacity and perverseness of Royal Academicians may be concealed? "THE MARRING OF ART," says Hazlitt, "IS  
"THE MAKING OF THE ROYAL ACADEMY."\*

Idem.  
p. 117.

The witnesses generally, the umpires of the Committee, the colleagues of the parties impeached, occasionally even the impeached parties themselves, the laws of vision, the authority of Science, all unite in support of the charges against the cleaning. This accumulation of confirmatory evidence the Committee utterly ignore. They were bound, *both in honour and in justice*, to report the decision of, at least, *their own umpires*. But it was unequivocally in favour of the charges; condemnatory of the Royal Academicians. Hence its suppression. The Committee inform us instead, that "Mr. Uwins  
"has characterized the evidence of Mr. Morris Moore as  
"displaying *a mass of ignorance and want of intelli-*

Report, p.x.

---

\* "It will be vain to attempt to force what can never be accomplished, at least by such Institutions as Royal Academies."

"I could never learn that the Arts were benefited by Royal Academies."—HOGARTH.

"For the advantage of Caro was, that he was Member of an *Academy*, and a whole College was engaged for him; and when neither reason nor truth was on their side, they confided in their numbers,  
"Defendit numerus, junctæque umbone phalanges."—BENTLEY,  
*Pref. to Diss. on Phalaris.*

"*gence :*" a judgment which applies equally to *Sir David Brewster*, to the *Committee's own umpires*, and,—with the exception of Mr. Uwins himself, Mr. Segquier, Mr. Leslie, R.A., and Mr. William Russell, the only persons who *unconditionally* approve of the cleaning—to *all the witnesses* examined on that subject.

Nieuwen-  
huys, Hart,  
R.A., &c.  
1725, 3316,  
3317, 3318.  
Segquier's,  
Russell's,  
and East-  
lake's Evid.  
and  
Lord Mont-  
eagle's Evid.  
5102, &c.

The contemptuous repudiation of Mr. Uwins's doctrines on Art by every witness invited to give an opinion upon them; the flat contradiction with which his account of his own official acts was repeatedly met by his co-operators; *the direct and unrefuted impeachment of his veracity* by Lord Monteagle, a Trustee—to say nothing of the low opinion which, it is well known, many members of the Committee freely expressed in regard both to his intelligence and to his trustworthiness, and none more strongly than the Chairman and Lord Elcho, the two leading members, who nevertheless appear in the "Proceedings" at the end of the Report as principal parties to the insertion of the passage in question—ought to have been sufficient to deter the Committee from venturing upon so flagrant a violation of decency, as that of identifying themselves with any statement of Mr. Uwins's, whether upon a question of Art, or of FACT.

The countenance given by the Committee to Mr. Uwins's authority, when taken in connexion with the *animus* which pervades the Report, can be viewed in no other light than as a covert attempt to vilify the chief witness, *and to throw discredit upon all who agree with him.*

The Report further charges Mr. Morris Moore with



“prejudice and personal animosity;” imputations for which we have discovered no better reason, than the appropriate expression of a natural indignation at the continued waste of public money on worthless productions, and the systematic defacement of master-pieces, perpetrated in defiance of all remonstrance. We feel bound to add moreover, that they come with singular ill grace from the Committee, after their repeated attempts to induce him to suppress one of the most important portions of his evidence, namely, that on the Purchases, upon the express ground that he “*had already proved his case without it* ;” Lord Elcho, the most prominent member, from his being the one who first gave notice of the motion for the inquiry,\* having backed those attempts, by impetuously urging upon him, in the presence of several persons,† that since his “enemy,” as he termed Sir C. Eastlake, “*lay prostrate at his feet*, further “incriminatory evidence would look rancorous and “unnecessarily protract the inquiry,” and that it was “*not English-like to kick a man when he was down* ;” as they thereby practically admitted, that in the aggravated nature of the circumstances which had led to his charges, there was even *more than sufficient* to justify them, without the additional stimulus of “personal animosity.” Had Mr. Morris Moore yielded to the solicitations of the Committee, he must have been prepared to share with them the suspicion of collusion, since he would then

Report, p. xi.

*Morning Post*, Nov. 9th and 15th, and Dec. 3rd, *Daily News*, Dec. 3rd, 1853.

\* Lord Elcho on account of his having obtained an appointment in the Treasury, transferred his motion to Col. Mure.

† June 17th, 1853.

have abandoned the discharge of a duty, in which no consideration of private feelings ought to have weighed against the public interest.

It is only an act of justice to Mr. Morris Moore to declare, that we highly commend him for having persisted, in spite of so many discouraging circumstances, in giving the evidence which the Committee so importuned him to omit. To this we feel bound to add, that by so doing, he has greatly contributed towards the complete exposure of the Abuses of the National Gallery.

But lest these imputations should fall short of their object, to lend an adventitious support to the accused by casting odium on the accuser, resort is had to the most direct of misrepresentations; the publication of the Report three months before that of the evidence enabling it for a time to pass current, since during that period, the Public were deprived of the means of comparison, and thereby prevented from ascertaining the truth.

In the same paragraph of the Report, upon which we have already animadverted so largely, we find the Report, p. x. following assertion; "Mr. Morris Moore further states, "that the evidence given by *almost every witness* "is worthless:" which means, that when he pronounced this apparently sweeping condemnation, he was in possession of the whole, or *almost* the whole, of the evidence. The sentence will bear no other interpretation. The sittings of the Committee were twenty-five in number; the different witnesses examined, *fifty-nine*, including Mr. Morris Moore. FIFTY-EIGHT persons therefore, are told that he had denounced, as "worthless," the evidence



given by *almost all*; and as the Committee leave undefined the exceptions implied by the word "almost," the censure is applicable to *each*. We should, under any circumstances, consider such an appeal to the passions, as unargumentative, irrelevant, and undignified; and moreover, as tending to defeat the aim of all inquiry, the discovery of Truth. But we feel imperatively called upon to PROTEST against it, when in order to subserve party purposes, it is introduced into a Report emanating from a Select Committee of the Legislature—a document which ought to be logical, to the point, dignified, and scrupulously solicitous for Truth.

But if, after all, it shall be shown that the Committee, at the time they drew up their Report, were in possession of the names of those to whom only Mr. Morris Moore's censure could have applied; and if, besides, it shall be proved that it was uttered at a period which would render the introduction of the word "almost," *a deliberate misrepresentation of fact*; there will then be little room to doubt, that like their unjustifiable appeal to the passions, the charge of "prejudice and personal animosity" was but the ungovernable manifestation of congenial infirmity, and that the Honourable Gentlemen who framed the Report, forgetting, *in their own prejudice and personal animosity against the chief witness*, their duty to the PUBLIC, and their own *self-respect*, allowed themselves to be so mastered by those unworthy passions, as not to scruple even at having recourse to that which paralyzes remonstrance, and which reason disdains to encounter.

On turning to the Blue Book, it will be found who

2278, 2384. it was that Mr. Morris Moore condemned, and what he said. Colonel Mure had repeatedly put upon him the evidence given on the cleaning by the preceding witnesses, and their confidence in their own judgment. At question 2390, the Chairman again reminds him of that evidence, and invites him to answer "these gentlemen, all of whom," says Col. Mure, "are quite confident of their experience and skill." Thus pointedly called upon, Mr. Morris Moore uses precisely these words: "with but one exception, the evidence of all the witnesses *hitherto* examined before this Committee is utterly worthless;" and he at once proceeds to give his reasons. The Committee *ignore the reasons, and garble the opinion.* Mr. Morris Moore, so far then from leaving any doubt as to the persons involved in his condemnation, clearly designates them. He tells us that they are, with one exception, all the witnesses examined up to the period indicated by the word "hitherto." Therefore the Committee, when framing their Report, *knew which, and how many*, of the fifty-eight witnesses those persons were. The printed evidence from which that document was made up, the very accuracy of the marginal number, 2390, which refers to the answer where the censure occurs, proves it. But as the word "hitherto" pointed to a particular period of the inquiry, and therefore *necessarily excluded from the censure all who had not been previously examined*, its insertion in the Report would have brought with it the inconvenience of limiting to a smaller, and a definite number, *the prejudice and personal animosity* it was, presumptively, the policy of the Committee to excite. *It was therefore suppressed, that each* of the fifty-eight



witnesses might feel the affront as especially levelled at himself, and the hostility of ALL be brought to bear against the chief witness with undivided force. But more remains to be told. The condemnatory expressions in question were uttered, not when Mr. Morris Moore had all, or *almost* all, the twenty-five days' evidence before him, as the Report intimates, but as early as the *fifth* sitting, and when *only eight* witnesses, including Mr. Nieuwenhuys, whom he excepted by name, had been examined. Consequently, they could have applied to *only seven*; namely, Messrs. Thwaites, Brown, Uwins R.A., Seguiet, Bolton, Farrer, and Bentley. 2396.

The *first two*, Messrs. Thwaites and Brown, gave no evidence on the recent picture-cleaning.

The *next two*, Messrs. Uwins R.A., and Seguiet, were the superintendent, and the performer of the operation.

The *fifth*, Mr. Bolton, declares that the 'Sheba' "is a cold scene, and *never* had much warmth in it;" that a "picture may be made raw," and yet "not be injured;" and that "had he cleaned the Rebecca himself," even "though he had *found* no glazing upon it," he "should have put a coat of warmth over it"—*of his own*—a convincing proof of his solicitude for preserving works of ancient art uncontaminated by spurious additions. 1031. 1051. 1042.

The *sixth*, Mr. Farrer, says of the 'Judgment of Paris,' by Rubens, and of the 'Boar Hunt,' by Velazquez, that before they were cleaned at the Gallery, the one "was in a perfect state," the other in a condition that "required nothing being done to it;" that "they certainly no longer possess the rich quality and colour, the brilliancy, pleasing effect, and spirit that 1411. 1426. 1418, 1419, 1428, &c.

- “they had;” but he nevertheless, “does not know that  
 “he can say *they have been injured*.” “The glazings  
 1305, 1475. “are gone,” he says, “from the ‘Sheba’—of that he is  
 1304, &c. “*quite convinced*;—the richness of colour has been taken  
 “away from the water; the whole picture has been  
 1479, 1390. “rendered too crude, and its commercial value dimi-  
 “nished *by the process it has undergone* :” yet he “cannot  
 1463. “say whether damage has been done *by the party who*  
 “*cleaned it or not* :” indeed, he “*thinks that a man*  
 1474. “*must have a great stretch of conscience who would take*  
 “*upon himself to say that Mr. Segwier had defaced it*.”  
 1450, 1451. It is moreover, his “decided opinion” that the cleaning  
 could not, *in any instance*, have been better managed  
 than it was; though he also declares, that “*one of the*  
 1497. “*Claudes alone should have taken the whole six weeks*,”  
 in which the cleaning of *all the nine pictures* was  
 accomplished; “those pictures, if cleaned at all,” he  
 says, “ought to have been cleaned *properly*,”—he “does  
 1509, 1510. “not think he should have undertaken to clean them  
 “*himself, even in six months*.”
- The *seventh and last*, Mr. Bentley, is of opinion that  
 1800. “the pictures have been cleaned a little too close;”  
 by which expression, “I mean,” he says, “that they are  
 1884, 1957. “crude and raw, that a portion of the *original texture*  
 “has been taken off;” a remark which he declares  
 1944. “*applies equally to all the nine* ;” notwithstanding  
 1942. this, his “opinion would be favourable—quite so—  
 “to *eight* of them,” although he thinks “their appear-  
 “ance would be much improved after a few years, if the  
 1917. “‘Gallery varnish’ were to be put over them again, *so as*  
 “*to hide their deformities*.”



Such is the extent, as regards number of witnesses, and such the character of the evidence that provoked the censure out of which the Committee fabricated the assertion, that Mr. Morris Moore had stigmatized, "as worthless," that which was not even in existence; an assertion entirely at variance with the accuracy which has characterized his statements throughout the National Gallery controversy, from 1846 to the present time. The Committee themselves paid, though unconsciously, the highest tribute to Mr. Morris Moore's accuracy when, with his evidence as yet incomplete, they were compelled to acknowledge that he had fully substantiated his charges.

Report, p. x.

Protest, | p.  
9 & 43.

Of the *fifty-eight* witnesses then who were examined, exclusive of Mr. Morris Moore, FIFTY-ONE are exempt from his condemnation; namely, one expressly excepted, and FIFTY who were not examined *until after its utterance*: to whom therefore, it was both morally and physically impossible it could have applied.

Comment on this lamentable incident would be superfluous. We now leave it to the Public.\*

---

\* The Report comes before the Public as the joint production of the Committee. Every member, therefore, is presumptively a party to this perversion of evidence. But all are not equally implicated. Some members were never present at the drawing up of any portion of the Report: others attended only occasionally. A summary of the "Proceedings of the Committee" will show who were the actual framers of the Special Report upon the Picture-cleaning, in which the misrepresentation occurs, and so help the Public to discover where the blame rests.

Report, p.  
xix.

#### SUMMARY OF "THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE COMMITTEE."

The Committee numbered seventeen members; namely, Col. Mure (the Chairman), Mr. Labouchere, Mr. Charteris (Lord Elcho),

Neither the oral nor the written testimony condemnatory of the cleaning is exhausted. For the mass of proof the Public are referred to the Blue Book.

## MANAGEMENT OF THE NATIONAL GALLERY.

### THE PAST MANAGEMENT.

The Committee declare that "the defects" in the Past Management of the National Gallery "are chargeable on "the *system*, rather than on the *individual managers*."

To affirm that the purchase of spurious and low-class pictures, the rejection of works of high excellence, though obtainable at half the cost, and the defacement of Master-pieces, are "defects," as the Committee blandly term them, of a *system*, and not chargeable on

---

Mr. Stirling, Mr. Raikes Currie, Mr. Monckton Milnes, Mr. Marshall, Lord Seymour, Mr. Vernon, Lord Brooke, Mr. Goulbourn, Mr. Ewart, Mr. B. Wall, Sir William Molesworth, Mr. Hardinge, Lord William Graham, and Mr. Hamilton.

There were ten meetings to consider the Report: the first five were devoted to the Special Report on the Picture-cleaning. Mr. Labouchere, Mr. Marshall, and Mr. Goulbourn were present at none of the meetings: Mr. Hamilton at none on the Special Report upon the Picture-cleaning. Mr. Raikes Currie attended only the first meeting, on which occasion the Chairman's Draft Report was read; the business of that day ending with the first paragraph being read a second time.

We would willingly believe that these five members are still ignorant of the details of the document issued in their names.

Lord Brooke's attendance was limited to the first and second meetings; Mr. Ewart's, to the first and third; Sir William Molesworth's, to the fifth; Mr. Stirling's, to the third, fourth, and fifth; Mr. Monckton Milnes's, to the first, second, third, and fourth. As none of these five members attended *all* the meetings on the Special Report upon the Picture-cleaning, and as they never met *simultaneously*, it is possible that



*individuals*, is to affirm that there can be an act without an agent, a puerility which, but for the public importance it here acquires, as involving *a misrepresentation of evidence*, would be beneath serious notice; since it must be obvious to all, except the wilfully obtuse, that the evil effects of measures are chargeable *solely on the individuals who advise and execute them*. To say nothing then of common sense, which at once points to the PROFESSIONAL CHIEFS of the National Gallery, the Keeper, and the President of the Royal Academy, a Trustee ex-officio, as *the individual managers especially responsible for all the measures executed there*, the statement of the Committee is in direct contradiction, not only to the declarations of various members of the Trust, but *to the admissions of the two individual managers just named*; for those declarations and admissions concur to

---

such as were not present at the insertion of the unworthy misstatement against Mr. Morris Moore, may never have been at the pains to ascertain what had been done in their absence, and may, on this account, not be aware of its existence.

The remaining seven members, Col. Mure, Lord Elcho, Lord Seymour, Mr. Vernon, Mr. B. Wall, Mr. Hardinge, and Lord William Graham, *were never once absent from the discussions on the Special Report upon the Picture-cleaning*. These seven members then, together with some of the five last named, though *which* of them we have no means to determine, are beyond a doubt, immediately responsible for the misrepresentation in question.

Col. Mure indeed, in his letter to the *Morning Post* of Dec. 17th, 1853, repudiated "The Report"—three months after its publication—in reply to a letter in which he was accused of having sanctioned in that document, *opinions directly at variance with those he had been heard to express*. Had he, as Chairman, protested against the insertion of such a clause as the one under consideration, it is scarcely credible that the Committee could have persisted in retaining it.

prove, that whatever may be the theoretical position of the Trustees, the practical control of the Gallery has *invariably* been left to the professional chiefs.

The professional chiefs whose proceedings necessitated the recent inquiry, are Sir C. Eastlake P. R. A. ex-Keeper, now a Trustee ex-officio, and Mr. Uwins R. A. the present Keeper. From November 1843, the period of Sir C. Eastlake's appointment to the Keepership, until the sitting of the Committee inclusive, not a picture was rejected whether offered as a gift or for sale, nor a picture purchased, without either his or Mr. Uwins's suggestion or assent; not a picture was cleaned, without either one or both of them having *authorised and superintended the operation*, and having by an emphatic approval, become, if possible, still more strictly responsible for the result.

The Trustees who appeared as witnesses, were Mr. William Russell, Lord Overstone, the Earl of Aberdeen, and Lord Monteagle. The following extracts from their evidence clearly show their opinions as to the position of the professional chiefs of the Gallery.

Mr. William Russell, appointed a Trustee August the 13th, 1850, says:—

4795-97-99, 4805-13. The Keeper was always present at all our meetings, and sat at our table. *Every communication* passing between the cleaner and the Trustees was with *the full privity of the Keeper*. It was perfectly open to him to have dissented from us. *I am sure the Trustees would always have listened to his advice*. The very office of Keeper *certainly* implies that he should take part in our discussions, and give his opinion, *even though it were not specially asked*.

Lord Overstone, a Trustee of the same date, says:—

5430-1. The Keeper is always present at the meetings of the Trustees, and there is *the most free and confidential intercourse* between them. His communications are always received with *great*



*respect.* I think he is *bound* to communicate freely and unreservedly with the Trustees on all matters, especially artistic matters, which come under their cognizance. I consider the Keeper to be selected by the Treasury for the purpose of taking the personal custody, superintendence, and control of the Gallery, *and RESPONSIBLE for the discharge of the very important duties of that office to the Treasury.*

The Earl of Aberdeen, one of the only two surviving original Trustees, appointed July the 7th, 1824, says:— 5266.

5283-4-5, 5328. To say the truth, I *never* felt that there was much *responsibility* imposed upon us (the Trustees). Mr. William Seguiet (the first Keeper) was the RESPONSIBLE AND PRINCIPAL DIRECTOR OF THE GALLERY, and the Trust was limited to what are the *proper* functions of Trustees, namely, to examining from time to time, and seeing that nothing improper was going on. The Trustees did not take upon themselves the details of management *at all*. I do not think the Trustees *should* interfere with details; such, for instance, as the question which has excited so much interest of late, I mean that of cleaning; I do not think these amateurs are very good judges as to that operation.

Lord Monteaale, whose connection with the Trust dates from the 26th of February 1835, nearly nine years before the death of the first Keeper, and who, *as one of its most busy members*, must be a competent authority, *at least as to the position of the officers* of the Institution, says:—

4979-80-1-2. During my long experience of the Trust, the Keeper of the Gallery, being *a professional gentleman*, was certainly expected to give his opinion to the Trustees, *whether asked or not, with respect to the care and the cleaning of pictures, and the various offers of pictures made to us, either in the way of purchase or of gift.* He was present at all our meetings. Both Sir C. Eastlake and Mr. William Seguiet were in the habit of very frankly taking part in our discussions.

4984-5-6. *No change has taken place with regard to the RESPONSIBILITY OF THE KEEPER since Sir C. Eastlake's resignation.* Both he

and Mr. Uwins have been *habitually consulted and empowered* in questions of picture-cleaning and otherwise. I am not aware of the *slightest difference* in the mode of dealing with them; *nor of a single instance in which the Trustees have come to a resolution that was not founded on a previous consultation with the Keeper.*

4988. I have always considered that it was part of the Keeper's distinct duty to express an opinion, and I have always felt *that he would be guilty of a gross dereliction of duty, if, when he saw any resolution about to be come to by the Trustees from which he dissented in respect to the pictures, he did not express to us in the strongest way his dissent from our judgment.*

5047-8-9. I can say, *most assuredly*, that the Trustees would not of themselves have sanctioned, or ordered the cleaning of *any* picture *without having the benefit of the professional advice and experience of the Keeper.* That was the practice during Sir C. Eastlake's tenure of office, and has been our practice *invariably.* There has been no departure from that practice since Mr. Uwins has held the office of Keeper.

The evidence of the members of the Trust therefore, establishes *the individual responsibility of the Keeper.*

To the above we may add the testimony of the picture-cleaner, who says:—

434, 699. I consider myself under the superintendence of the Keeper. I have *always* been in the habit of receiving my instructions from the KEEPER.

We now come to the admissions of the Keeper, and of the President of the Royal Academy.

Mr. Uwins R.A. the Keeper, says:—

31, 2764. It is *my duty* to examine the pictures, and to judge how far cleaning of *any kind* may be necessary or desirable. *As KEEPER of the Gallery I am certainly RESPONSIBLE for the safe custody and protection of the pictures, and for their general good condition.\**

---

\* Mr. Uwins here admits his responsibility; but he occasionally denies it. His admissions are frequent and distinct. We will now show



Sir C. Eastlake P. R. A., ex-Keeper and Trustee, says :—

4394-5-8, 4415-7-8. When I became KEEPER, *I held myself to be RESPONSIBLE for all purchases made in the Gallery and for cleaning, for*

---

*the value of his denial.* At page 42, we stated that Mr. Uwins's account of his own official acts was repeatedly met by a flat contradiction from his cooperators, and *by a direct impeachment of his veracity* from Lord Monteagle. The following extracts from Mr. Uwins's evidence and theirs, will prove not only the correctness of that statement, but also that Mr. Uwins flatly contradicts *himself*.

#### UWINS v. HIMSELF.

15, 31. Mr. Uwins.] *I certainly CONSIDER IT MY DUTY, as Keeper, to superintend the state of the Gallery, to examine the pictures from time to time, to look after the condition of the pictures, and to judge how far cleaning of any kind may be necessary or desirable.*

33, 44. Mr. Uwins.] *I am not aware that it is part of my duty, on observing any of the pictures to be in a state which appears to me to render it desirable that they should be cleaned, to recommend to the Trustees that that operation should be performed. I DO NOT FEEL IT TO BE MY DUTY TO GIVE AN OPINION ABOUT THAT.*

#### SEGUIER (the Cleaner) v. UWINS.

34, 35. Mr. Uwins.] The Trustees have, *in many cases, either judged for themselves, or taken other advice than mine* as to whether a picture did or did not require cleaning. They have been *in the habit of communicating direct with the cleaner, and taking his opinion as to the desirableness of cleaning pictures.*

434, 699. Mr. Seguer.] I consider myself under the superintendence of the Keeper. *I have ALWAYS been in the habit of receiving my instructions FROM THE KEEPER.*

#### EASTLAKE P. R. A. v. UWINS R. A.

10, 11, 13, 33. Mr. Uwins.] When I succeeded Sir C. Eastlake, as Keeper, I consulted him on the nature of my duties. *I received no instructions with regard to giving my opinion as to whether the pictures*

the state of the collection, and of the establishment, *for the general management of the National Gallery*. As Keeper, I was always present at all the meetings of the Trustees. I considered it *my duty* to make *spontaneous* suggestions to the Trustees, and I was in the habit of doing so.

4440-3-4, 5932. I suggested to the Trustees that some of the

---

*should be cleaned or not. I have no responsibility of that kind. I HAVE NEVER BEEN SO INSTRUCTED.*

4420-2. Sir C. Eastlake.] I QUITE WELL REMEMBER TELLING MR. UWINS THAT HE WAS TO BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE CLEANING; and that the Trustees expected him *to suggest that the pictures should be cleaned, if they appeared to him to require it.*

#### EASTLAKE, RUSSELL, AND MONTEAGLE v. UWINS.

37, 40, 48. Mr. Uwins.] *I was not consulted AT ALL with regard to the cleaning of the nine pictures. I have no responsibility of that kind. If it had been for me to suggest that they should have been subjected to the process of cleaning, I should not have done it certainly; but it was not; Mr. Seguer was consulted.*

4454. Sir C. Eastlake.] *I confess that this statement of Mr. Uwins's SOMEWHAT SURPRISES ME.*

4797-9, 4800-1-3-5-6. Mr. William Russell.] *Every communication passing between Mr. Seguer and the Trustees was with the full privity of Mr. Uwins. I am quite sure Mr. Uwins was present at all our discussions on the cleaning, and that we considered he was taking part in any discussion we may have had. I considered that the whole thing was done with his concurrence; and that therefore it was not done independently of Mr. Uwins. I consider that virtually he was consulted. I was undoubtedly most distinctly of opinion that Mr. Uwins entirely concurred in our proposition to clean the pictures. His whole manner raised that impression in my mind. I am sure that he never expressed any dissent whatever to their being cleaned. I was not aware of Mr. Uwins having entertained any other opinion, NOR DO I BELIEVE HE DID.*

4986-7, 5056, 5062, 5102. Lord Monteaagle.] This statement of Mr. Uwins's undoubtedly comes upon me with a great deal of surprise. *We have NEVER consulted Mr. Seguer without the know-*



pictures should be cleaned. *They gave me FULL POWER to select such pictures as I thought fit, WITHOUT SPECIFYING WHAT, and to have them cleaned entirely at my own discretion.* In respect to the cleaning of pictures, the Trustees *transferred their RESPONSIBILITY entirely to ME.*

Here we have Sir C. Eastlake's admission, that,

---

*ledge and consent of the Keeper.* There was nothing left in my mind, or, so far as I know, in the mind of any of the Trustees with whom I have ever communicated, that implied, *directly or indirectly*, disapproval by Mr. Uwins. With reference to the last cleaning, in the written report he made to us, Mr. Uwins says : " On the subject of these pictures, I beg " to include Mr. Segquier's report to me, as asked for by the Trustees at " their last meeting ; in addition to which, I have to state that I " attended daily at the Gallery *to watch the proceedings.* Nothing could " exceed the care and caution with which Mr. Segquier executed his " commission ; and I feel confident that the result will be found " *satisfactory.*" I refer to that now, simply to show you that even when we come to a *written* report, there is nothing upon it to mark the slightest possible mistrust on the part of Mr. Uwins, *still less of disapproval* of the undertaking of the work. *It is now for the first time that I hear even a suggestion that he was not a party to all that was done, and I should be still more surprised if there were any disposition on his part to withdraw from that* RESPONSIBILITY. I can only say that his exposition of his view of his own functions and duties is *entirely at variance* with what I have *uniformly* considered it to be, and with the *uniformity* which I have considered to be *the practice likewise* ; we have invited the fullest and freest discussion on the part of our Keeper, *whether he was Sir C. Eastlake or Mr. Uwins* ; and that we are to have a *professional man* placed at our table in the condition of Keeper, that he is to sit by, and have a strong impression of a *negative kind* with respect to a proposition that was before us, *with the execution of which he was afterwards charged*, and on which he was afterwards called on to report *in writing*, that he should have a *negative opinion*, and *never express it*, is a matter which excites THE MOST UNBOUNDED ASTONISHMENT ON MY PART, AND COMES UPON ME UTTERLY BY SURPRISE.

To this vehement climax, Lord Monteagle vehemently added, "IT

1089, 4462, as Keeper, his control over the National pictures  
 4463, 4608, was *absolute*. That he entertained no misgivings as to  
 4657, 5044, the unlimited nature of his power, is shown by his  
 &c. having gone even the length of ordering several pictures  
 to be cleaned, "*on his sole authority, without any previous*  
*knowledge on the part of the Trustees.*"

In respect to Picture-purchasing, Sir C. Eastlake says:—

6010-1-7, 6176. Whenever a picture or a collection of pictures was offered to the consideration of the Trustees, it was their custom to send the Keeper to examine it, and to make a Report upon the subject. *I undertook that duty. If I reported that it was not worthy of their attention, nothing more was thought of it. I wish to state, as plainly as possible, THAT I MIGHT HAVE PREVENTED THE PURCHASE OF THE 'HOLBEIN.'* \*

4797, 5430, "IS NOT TRUE;" but immediately requested the Reporter not to put  
 &c. these words down; a very questionable assumption of authority on his part. But even *without* them, Lord Monteagle distinctly charges Mr. Uwins with FALSEHOOD; for his "astonishment" could not have been "*unbounded*," had he not *known* Mr. Uwins's statement to be FALSE. This occurred on the 6th of June, 1853. Since that time eighteen months have elapsed; but Mr. Uwins still "sits at the  
 "table" of the Trustees; is still "listened to" by Mr. William Russell; still maintains "the most free and confidential intercourse" with Lords Overstone and Monteagle; still enjoys their "GREAT  
 "RESPECT."

\* Elsewhere in his evidence Sir C. Eastlake says:—

6416. If Sir Robert Peel had entrusted me with £20,000 to lay out in pictures, I would gladly have accepted the responsibility; I think I should have given *satisfaction, and I would not have purchased the "Holbein."*

So that according to Sir C. Eastlake's process of reasoning, he "would not have done," WITH MORE THAN THIRTY TIMES THE MEANS FOR DOING IT, the very thing which he *did*, although he had



Sir C. Eastlake then, upon his own showing, exercised, as Keeper, a paramount authority, also upon the question of Purchases.\* Not even the acquisition of that modest memorial of academic proficiency, the

---

*the option*, as "he wishes to state as plainly as possible," of *not* doing it!

It will scarcely be credited that, in spite of the emphatic admissions we have quoted from Sir C. Eastlake's evidence, *as to his own individual RESPONSIBILITY*, there is a letter from him, published as an Appendix to the Blue Book, in which he has the effrontery to say that "it is the *system*, rather than any *individual* mismanagement, which "he thinks open to objection."

Blue Book  
Appendix  
No. XVI, p.  
787.

\* Sir C. Eastlake, when Keeper, was the *sole* Director of the Gallery. Once indeed, with regard to the purchase of a picture, his professional superior, the President of the Royal Academy, at that time Sir Martin Shee, exercised his authority. Sir C. Eastlake himself commemorates the instance, and at the same time, *his own docility*. It is to Sir Martin Shee, that we owe the rejection of one of the noblest works of Art ever offered to the Trustees; namely, the unfinished 'Virgin and Child with Saints,' by Michael Angelo, exhibited in 1847, at the British Institution. This picture was in Sir C. Eastlake's room at the Gallery, *at the same time* as the "Holbein." The price of the former was £500. In his evidence before the Committee, Sir C. Eastlake takes considerable credit to himself for having made an offer of £250—less than half the difference between what he *gave* for the 'Susanna and the Elders,' and the sum for which he *could* have obtained it a short time before. The £250 was refused. Sir C. Eastlake revenged himself by giving *six hundred guineas* for his "Holbein."

6179.

9953-4.

6178-80.

But to those who, not being able to judge of the respective merits of these works, or not having had an opportunity of comparing them, may be sceptical as to these two Presidents of the Royal Academy having preferred a *daub at six hundred guineas to a Masterpiece at five hundred pounds*, the following record of their opinions on Art will serve as a key to so *apparently* strange an anomaly.

On the 15th of July 1836, before the select Committee of Arts

6113, 6388. "Holbein," which *after two years and a half subsequent retention of office*, and five years further meditation, he, in his riper judgment, assures the Committee is "SUCH A MISTAKE AS HE CAN HARDLY ASSUME SUCH A DIRECTOR AS HE THINKS FIT FOR THE NATIONAL

and Manufactures, Question 2041, the *first* of these representatives of Royal Academic intelligence, Sir Martin Shee, says:—

"I consider the Royal Academy *a much more important institution to the Nation than the National Gallery*; I look upon it that a garden is of more consequence than a granary, (P) and you may heap up a HORTUS-SICCUS of Art without producing any of the *salutary effects* which *never fail to result* from the operations of *such a school as the Royal Academy*. It would, therefore, I conceive, be *an injury to the Nation*, as well as to the Royal Academy, if they were to be removed, in order to make room FOR EVEN THE BEST WORKS OF THE OLD MASTERS."

Rep. on Sel. Com. of Art-  
Unions, of  
1844. 4484,  
4495-6-7,  
&c.

On the 22nd of January, 1844, before the Select Committee on Art-Unions, the *second* of these Academic luminaries, Sir C. Eastlake, says, that "the issuing of outlines after the manner of RETSCH is proof of a desire to do the *utmost to promote the higher class of Art*; that he would recommend that subjects to be selected for engraving should be taken from *living*, not *ancient* artists, since the *former are fine enough to promote public taste*; and that he would not recommend the engraving of drawings of the Great Masters, such as those of MICHAEL ANGELO AND RAPHAEL in the collection at Oxford, *because it requires a very cultivated taste to relish such things, and they would not be quite the class of works to put into the hands of uncultivated amateurs*." This last sentiment gives us the following striking corollary,—that what is best adapted to "a very cultivated taste," is not calculated to *cultivate* taste. But these opinions were delivered *ten years ago*. For his more *matured* convictions, such as, that "rubbing dirt over pictures *will much improve them*, when cleaning has been carried too far, and when the softness of outlines has been destroyed by over-cleaning;" that Claude is "*wooden*," &c.; we refer the Public to his evidence in the Blue Book, and to the quotations from it in this PROTEST.

Blue Book,  
4723, 4586,  
4592, 4724,  
&c.



"GALLERY WOULD MAKE," caused any curtailment of his power. The Treasury indeed, on learning that the "Holbein" was *spurious*, made an *apparent* change in the mode of purchasing. They wrote a letter, he informs us, "at his express request,"—for, as Mr. Hume said in the House of Commons, "Sir C. Eastlake is the "man who *does everything, directs everything; and that it is no wonder, therefore, that everything should be done in the strangest manner,*"—suggesting that in future purchases, it would be desirable "that two *competent* persons "should be consulted." But, as if to exhaust absurdity on the National Gallery, this Treasury intimation was made to stultify itself by being coupled with the injunction, that the "competent persons" should be chosen by the very individual whose *self-admitted incompetency* had caused this seeming encroachment on the original and natural jurisdiction of his office. SIR C. EASTLAKE was to name the "competent persons!" As though the incompetent were the fit judges of competency in others! Even Sir C. Eastlake is sufficiently in advance of the Treasury to tell us that "*the responsibility would rest with him who selected the advisers.*"

6019, 6182, &amp;c.

Parliament.  
Deb. on Nat.  
Gal., March  
8th, 1853.M. of Trust.  
1845-6, p. 5

6367, 6389.

The 'Susanna and the Elders' was the immediate fruit of the Treasury innovation. The purchase of this picture furnishes an instance of that *unnecessarily* wasteful expenditure to which we have alluded under the head of "The Purchasing of Pictures." When only a few months previously it was to be obtained for *seven hundred and fifty pounds*, the "system," as the Committee would say, thought it unworthy of their notice. A dealer saw his opportunity, and secured it for that

Protest, p. 8.

M. of Trust. sum. Sir C. Eastlake *now* appreciated its "*intrinsic*  
 1845-6, p. 4. "*merit*," the *historical* evidence of its genuineness, and  
 "its *peculiar value* to the Gallery, as the *companion*  
 "picture, to 'Lot and his Daughters;'" a "*peculiar*  
 6086. "*value*" however, for which he has since pleasantly as-  
 sured us "there is no historical ground." Appraised at  
 fifteen hundred guineas by a "competent person" of  
 M. of Trust. his own selecting, it is purchased at twelve hundred, as  
 1845-6, p. 5. "a *very* desirable addition, *at that price*," to those kindred  
 acquisitions, the "Holbein," and the mock Guido, 'The  
 Youthful Christ embracing St. John.'\*

\* The purchase of the 'Tribute Money' affords a still more flagrant  
 instance of wanton waste, and illustrates our statement that the folly  
 of the Trustees has reached even the extravagant height of giving for  
 an objectionable picture, *more than double the price* at which they  
 could have obtained it only a short time before. A few months pre-  
 vious to the Soult sale this pseudo Titian was in London. Marshal  
 Soult's executors had sent it here together with a *genuine* Sebastiano  
 del Piombo, representing 'Christ bearing the Cross,' with a view of  
 selling one or the other, or both, to the Government, by private con-  
 tract. They were here seen by some of the Trustees. The price of  
 each picture was £1,200, but it is said that an offer of £2,000 for the  
 two would not have been refused. As no bid was made for either, they  
 were sent back to Paris to be sold by auction with the rest of the  
 Soult collection. The sale was to take place towards the end of May  
 1852, and a few days later, the sale, also in Paris, of a collection  
 belonging to a M. Collot. The Trustees *now* bestir themselves. They  
 take no heed of the genuine S. del Piombo, not they, but they *must*  
 have the spurious and once despised "Titian;" "it would fill some im-  
 portant place in their *series*." Accordingly, "At a meeting of the  
 Trustees of the National Gallery, held on Monday, the 10th of May  
 1852"—a few days before the Soult sale—it was "Resolved," under  
 the auspices of Sir C. Eastlake and Mr. Uwins, "That a communica-  
 tion be made to the Lords of the Treasury, informing their Lord-

Protest, p. 8.

Eastlake's  
 Evid., 6073.

Min. of Trust  
 of 1847-52,  
 p. 45.



After this satisfactory illustration of the *practical* identity of the "Holbein" and "Treasury" systems, the apparent suspension of the Keeper's undivided authority ceased, and the "Holbein" system was tacitly reestab-

---

"ships that the sales of the pictures of Mons. Collot and of the late Marshal Soult are about to take place at Paris, and that the following pictures would be *a most advantageous addition to the National Gallery, and* CONDUCTIVE OF BENEFIT TO ART IN ENGLAND, and that the prices affixed are sums which it would be PRUDENT to offer :

"Titian, 'Tribute Money,' from £2,500 to £3,000,

"Palma Vecchio, 'The Marriage of St. Catharine,' from £1,000 to £1,500.

"And that the Trustees ask the authority of the Treasury to employ Mr. William Woodburn, who has been already employed under the authority of their Lordships,"—with Mr. Uwins, in an expedition to Venice that resulted in a report on the Manfrini Collection, which report these *same* Trustees, including Sir C. Eastlake, have condemned as worthless—"to make a purchase of these pictures at a price not exceeding £4,500." The science of Political Economy is indebted to the Trustees of the National Gallery for the discovery that it is "prudent" to offer in Paris, from two thousand five hundred to *three thousand pounds*, for the identical picture it would have been rash to purchase in London for, at most, *twelve hundred*. So great indeed is *now* their eagerness to impose upon the *Public*, an unnecessary price for a useless article, that at a subsequent meeting on the 17th of the same month, it was "Resolved, That Mr. Woodburn be requested to understand, that the Trustees wish to repeat their instructions to him to bid as far as £3,000, if necessary, for the 'Tribute Money,' and to bid £1,500, if necessary, for the 'Palma Vecchio.' The Trustees desire further to explain, that if Mr. Woodburn should be able to secure the 'Tribute Money' for *less* than £3,000, he may venture to bid *WHATEVER SURPLUS* out of the £4,500 he may have left, for the 'PALMA VECCHIO.'"

5375-91-2,  
6139, 6144,  
&c.

Min. of Trust  
of 1847-52,  
p. 46.

The 'Tribute Money' was "secured" for £2,604; which sum with

lished. Again *the bare word of the Keeper* became final as to the eligibility of pictures offered to the Trustees, whether for sale or as gifts. At one time, Mr. Uwins proceeds to Bristol, "to view a picture attributed to

M. of Trust.  
1847-52,  
pp. 25 & 26.

£9. 8s. 2d. for carriage, &c., makes £613. 8s. 2d., or, *at the least*, £413. 8s. 2d. beyond *double the price* that was required for the *same* picture in London. Of the original £4,500, there still remained £1,896, "if necessary," for the Palma Vecchio. *It was knocked down for* £168. At last then, the Trustees had obtained *a bargain!* "*A most advantageous addition to the National Gallery,*" a picture that would be "CONDUCTIVE OF BENEFIT TO ART IN ENGLAND," for one hundred and sixty-eight pounds,—one thousand seven hundred and twenty-eight pounds *less than their commission!* The £1,404, lost in the 'Tribute Money,' *more* than recovered in the Palma Vecchio—recovered with the handsome balance of £324. to boot! It is not surprising that on the arrival of this brace of Masterpieces, the Trustees flushed with so great a triumph, and invigorated by "the most important presence and most valuable assistance," as Lord Overstone has it, "of Sir C. EASTLAKE," and further stimulated by "having had the pictures by TITIAN and PALMA VECCHIO under their inspection and consideration," should have "Resolved, That these pictures be brought before the Public *without loss of time.*" Nor could they have done less than "Resolve *further*, That THE THANKS of the Trustees"—including Sir C. Eastlake's—"be conveyed to Mr. Woodburn for his attention to their *wishes* with respect to the purchases of pictures he has made for them in Paris."

Min. of Trust.  
of 1847-52  
p. 46.

Overstone's  
Evid. 5432.

Min. of Trust.  
of 1847-52.  
p. 47.

The "TITIAN" is before us, and is not unappreciated. Upon further consideration, however, Sir C. Eastlake "considers that the result of the Paris purchase was *not satisfactory.*" He even "ventures to entertain DOUBTS," such are his words, "of Mr. Woodburn's *judgment.*" he "should *suppose* it not likely that Mr. Woodburn will be employed by the Trustees on a similar mission *again*;" but "still," says he, "my opinion relates *merely* to the case in question, and to *connoisseurship*;" "my *general* respect for Mr. Woodburn remains unchanged." Indeed! How gratifying to the Public, *after* the "prudent" Paris transaction, the



"Raphael, for the purpose of reporting his opinion of it to the Trustees." He found it "unfitting for the Gallery." *Nothing more was thought of it.* At another 6017. time, under the tutelage of a "competent person," jointly

issue of which depended on Mr. Woodburn's "connoisseurship *merely*," to learn that Sir C. Eastlake's "*doubts* as to Mr. Woodburn's judgment" relate "*merely* to his *connoisseurship*!" Again, even Mr. Russell, in spite of his "thanks" for its purchase, "confesses, that he, for one, was 8178-9. "*somewhat disappointed* when the 'Tribute Money' arrived in this 'Country;" but then, "*I have no doubt*," he adds, "that it is a TITIAN; I do not advocate it as a *very fine* Titian, but *the longer* I know that picture *the more* I *admire* it." How profound, how deserving of confidence must that conviction upon a question relating to Titian be, which has for its basis, "no knowledge" of Titian that 4915. can be "relied on!"

But where is that "most advantageous" *unadded* "addition to the 'National Gallery,'" the Picture that was *more* than to make up for all short-comings—our PALMA VECCHIO? "Purchased," says Sir C. 6218. Eastlake, "by Lord Lansdowne." And here we again have a notable instance of that perfect agreement of "Taste" with each other and with themselves, which prevails among those "Men of Taste" who have undertaken to give a "Taste" to the Nation. Sir C. Eastlake first "Resolves, That the Palma Vecchio be brought before the Public "without loss of time." He "Resolves *further*," his "thanks" for its purchase; and then, true to his idiosyncrasy, says, that "this most "advantageous addition" is "*decidedly not worthy a place in the Na-* 6219. "*tional Collection.*" Lord Lansdowne, on the other hand, must think that *it is*. He buys it for himself; but, "it is not to be understood," says Sir C. Eastlake, "that he purchased it in order to "*relieve the "Gallery.* Lord Lansdowne purchased the picture," says the same authority, because "*he admired it very much.*" According to Sir C. Eastlake then, the case between the Public and Lord Lansdowne stands thus:—Lord Lansdowne, a Trustee of National property, abstracts, for his *own purposes*, from his Trust, that which he believed to be a valuable property of that Trust: for surely he *must* have be-

M. of Trust.  
of 1847-52,  
pp. 36, 37,  
and 43.

5375-91-92,  
6139, 6144,  
&c.

selected by himself and Sir C. Eastlake, Mr. Uwins is dispatched to Venice, as the representative of British connoisseurship, *and at a cost of three hundred pounds to the Public*, to report upon "the authenticity and condition" of the Manfrini collection. His "report" is found, even by Sir C. Eastlake's admission, to be *worthless*; a notable and compound example of the *economy*, as well as wisdom of leaving *the incompetent to judge of the capability of others*. Had Sir C. Eastlake been equal to his position, he would have known the incompetency of Mr. Uwins, and so have foreseen the result of trusting such a person with any mission requiring a knowledge of Art.\* Thus much of the Keeper.

lieved that to be valuable which he thought deserving of so much admiration. If *one* Trustee may select any picture "he admires very much," why may not *another*? Where then is the *National Collection*? We reprobate this secret tampering with Public property. This "Palma Vecchio," or whatever it may be, ought to have been *forthcoming*. The PUBLIC ought at least to be allowed a chance of expressing their opinion with regard to the transfer of what is their own. Even *had* Lord Lansdowne purchased the "Palma Vecchio" with a view to "relieve" the Nation of a *bad bargain*, which Sir C. Eastlake flippantly declares *he did not*, are the ghastly "cleaning," the purchase of *bad* pictures, the rejection of *fine* ones, arguments to convince us that the Trustees may not have discarded a *desirable* work? Had Lord Lansdowne, instead of fixing his "admiration" on the one hundred and sixty-eight pounds' Palma Vecchio, bestowed it on Mr. William Russell's *two thousand six hundred and nine pounds'* "Titian," the boldness of the speculation might, perhaps, so have dazzled us, as to have prevented too close an investigation of the objectionable character of the transaction. *As it is*, there is nothing to divert attention from *the violation of a principle*; nothing to convince us that *exposure has not been bought off at a paltry pecuniary sacrifice*.

\* Notwithstanding the worthlessness of Mr. Uwins's "report" upon



With respect to the other professional chief of the National Gallery, the President of the Royal Academy, Mr. William Russell declares that he "should be *most unwilling* to press any point against his opinion, since, "of course, it must be very much better than his own;" Lord Overstone, that he "feels his presence among them to be *most important*, and his assistance *most valuable*;" Lord Monteagle, that he "would not be disposed to do without *both his* and the Keeper's opinion;" while Sir C. Eastlake, the very functionary in question, maintains that "the Trustees *could not but be influenced* by the judgment of the President of the "Royal Academy."

Russell's  
Evid. 4826,  
4841.

Lord Over-  
stone's Evid.  
5432.

Lord Mont-  
eagle's Evid.  
4995.

Eastlake's  
Evid., 6179.

The waste of Public money on spurious and ignoble works *since Sir C. Eastlake became a Trustee*, some of which were purchased even while the Committee were sitting;\* the extravagant £300 expedition to Venice, which could not have taken place but for his inability to detect Mr. Uwins's inefficiency; the revival of the fatal cleaning system of 1846, which had ceased with his resignation of the Keepership, *and was resumed only on the renewal of his connexion with the Gallery*; all testify that he has formed no exaggerated estimate of the in-

7027, *et seq.*,  
to 7052.

---

the Manfrini pictures, the Trustees, in voting the sum to defray the expenses of his journey to Venice, declare it to be "A COMPENSATION FOR HIS VALUABLE SERVICES."

M. of Trust.  
of 1847-52,  
p. 43.

\* The pictures purchased during the sitting of the Committee are, — 'A Monk Praying,' Zurbaran, £265, 7th May; 'The Adoration,' Velazquez, £2050, 24th May; and 'The Virgin and Child with a Knight,' "Giorgione," £525, 14th June, 1853.

*fluence* exercised over the Trustees by the President of the Royal Academy.

INDIVIDUAL MANAGERS then, namely, THE KEEPER AND THE PRESIDENT OF THE ROYAL ACADEMY, are *directly and primarily chargeable* with the mismanagement of the National Gallery.\*

We PROTEST against the statement of the Committee that the abuses which necessitated the recent inquiry are “chargeable on the *system*, rather than on *individual*

Report,  
pp. iii & xiv.

---

\* Sir C. Eastlake disdains no means to shirk responsibility. He excuses his neglect of fine early Italian pictures, when Keeper, as follows:—“I am *bound to say* that SIR ROBERT PEEL rather opposed the “purchase of works by the early Italian Masters; his expression *always* 6023. “*was*, ‘I think we should not collect *curiosities*.’ I always advocated 6025. “the purchase of good Italian pictures; but my suggestions were not 6026. “responded to by all the Trustees, and *particularly not* by SIR ROBERT “PEEL.” The works of Giotto, Fiesole, Masaccio, Lippi, Botticelli, Gozzoli, Ghirlandaio, Mantegna, &c., those mighty leaders of a mighty host—*curiosities*! The sceptics in the *classicality* of Sir Robert Peel’s *taste* may exult in this triumphant vindication of their sagacity, by a creature of his own; but who would sympathize with one, who, catching at a servile and untrustworthy excuse for *himself*, does not hesitate to say, that which he must have *known*—for he *condemns* it—would expose the emptiness of his deceased patron’s pretensions to taste, and cover his name with ridicule?—

“Absentem qui rodit amicum,  
Qui non defendit alio culpante—  
Hic niger est; hunc tu, Romane, caveto.

It was a *servile* excuse, for Sir C. Eastlake was the *professional*, and 5284. as Lord Aberdeen declares, THE RESPONSIBLE AND PRINCIPAL DIRECTOR of the Gallery. He ought, therefore, to have *resigned* rather than have pandered to Sir Robert Peel’s barbarisms. The National Gallery, as its title indicates, is the property of the PEOPLE,



*managers,”* as repugnant to common sense, as betraying favouritism towards members of the Royal Academy, and as conveying a MISREPRESENTATION OF EVIDENCE.

### THE FUTURE MANAGEMENT.

The suggestions of the Committee for the future management of the National Gallery are contained in the following eight resolutions :—

Report,  
p. xv.

1. That it is the opinion of the Committee *that a system of management by a Board of Trustees be continued.*

The system the Committee here recommend is the

---

not the toy of an *individual*—whatever his station. *Efficiently* managed, it is a source of honour : *inefficiently*, of disgrace.

It was an *untrustworthy* excuse, for Sir C. Eastlake says :—“ Sir Robert Peel *especially wanted me as a judge* [!] *of the Italian Schools* ; 4393. “ I undertook the Keepership *on the understanding* that I was to be “ chiefly consulted respecting *the Italian Masters* ; I always advocated 6025. “ the purchase of *good Italian pictures* ; and I always felt very grateful 6030. “ to Sir Robert Peel for the *confidence* he reposed in me ; ” expressions which, taken with Sir Robert Peel’s declaration in Parliament that Sir C. Eastlake’s “ knowledge of Art was *consummate*,” afford the strongest presumption, to say nothing of the Minutes of the Trustees, *which prove it*, that, had Sir C. Eastlake insisted on the purchase of what his patron was pleased to term “ curiosities,” the latter would not have persevered in his senseless opposition.

Parl. Debates  
Jan. 27th,  
1847.

But, doubtful as to the efficacy of his generous oblation to the manes of his patron, Sir C. Eastlake is tempted in an evil moment, to hazard an excuse at the expense of the *living*. He says :—“ *I remember* MR. 6036. “ HUME saying that he thought it inexpedient at present,” in 1847, “ to “ continue purchases—*purchases of any kind*—for the National Gallery, “ and *I remember THAT having had an influence upon the Trustees.*” The Committee, more tender of Mr. Hume’s good name than they have been of their *own*, cross-questioned Sir C. Eastlake somewhat sharply as to Mr. Hume’s “ unwillingness that the public money should be applied 6039.

Report,  
pp. iii & xiv.

identical one they condemn as anomalous, and as chargeable with the "defects" of the past management. The theory of professional authority subordinate to unprofessional, is to be maintained, to be again contradicted in practice; since the *real* control of the Gallery must, as before, devolve on the professional chiefs. The continuance of a system devoid of reason is recommended for the sake of gratifying the personal vanity of a few influential self-styled "Men of Taste." "Defects" of management will again be charged on the *system*;

in this way." This occurred on the 17th of June, 1853. The allegation against Mr. Hume having in the mean time elicited further comment, Sir C. Eastlake at his next examination but one, on the 6575. 24th of June, found it expedient to say:—"I am reminded that when "I was examined on a former day, I stated *my impression*"—the statement was *direct* and *repeated*—"that Mr. Hume had objected to "means being furnished for the purchase of pictures in the National "Gallery. I think it right to say I have searched in vain for anything "of the kind in the papers; it is a very laborious undertaking to hunt "even through Hansard, and his reports are not always full"—that is, his charge against Mr. Hume may still be just—"but I have not "found it. I cannot help retaining the conviction that I once saw "*something* of the kind; but I would rather that my *accuracy* should "be impeached than Mr. Hume's *generosity*, and I *must* say that in "my late search I found numerous instances tending to show that "Mr. Hume is *always liberal* when the public improvement is concerned." So, after hunting through Hansard to convict Mr. Hume of *narrow-minded parsimony*, thence to shift on *him* the blame due to his own incompetence alone, he not only "finds" that Mr. Hume is "*always liberal*," but with grovelling obsequiousness protests, that Mr. Hume's fame for *generosity* is dearer to him than his own for *accuracy*, and that it is an eminent exercise of the former virtue to vote a *Nation's* money for a *Nation's* "improvement."



defects of system, "the want of *a clear definition* of the powers and responsibilities of the managing body of the Institution," &c., will again become the cry for rescuing the incompetent nominee of Ministerial or Court favour, from responsibility for his own acts.

The recent inquiry has taught us the value of an unprofessional Board. They assemble indeed during "the season," at monthly meetings of "Taste," where, lacking knowledge sufficient to protect themselves from becoming the dupes of even the grossest impositions, or with just the "dangerous little learning," to spurn the excellent and clutch the worthless; where, undaunted by their mock Guidos, mock Durers, mock Titians, and mock Holbeins, they arrogate to themselves to determine the effect of Masterpieces, and authorize privileged incompetency to superintend, and empiricism to consummate, the undoing of that which it required all the genius of a Claude or a Titian, and the passionate labour of a life to achieve. Works whose splendour and vigour astonished and delighted the world, suddenly dissolve into phantoms of their former selves. What yesterday was stamped with the virility of genius, to-day is a pitiful emasculation. But the "Board" again meet, and "the result is *entirely satisfactory*." The "Men of "Taste" "Resolve," and the mutilated Masterpieces "evince an improved appearance,"—though they "*loved* "them better in their *former state*." This *among themselves*. Publicly challenged to give an account of their stewardship, they all on a sudden discover that their "opinion on the subject of picture-cleaning *is not worth much*," "stand *conscious of their own inadequacy* to

Meeting  
of Trustees,  
Nov. 12th,  
1852.

Lord  
Monteagle's  
Evid. 5072, &  
Protest, p. 13.

Lord Mont-  
eagle's Evid.  
5008, 5117,  
5075, &c.

Lord Over-  
stone's Evid.  
5398, 5409.

Lord Mont-  
eagle's Evid.  
5064.

Idem,  
5112-4,  
5118.

Russell's  
Evid., 4902,  
4915.

"deal with questions of cleaning," "*tremble* to pro-  
"nounce a judgment," "do not *at all* intend to set  
"themselves up as *judges*, nor pretend to a *critical*  
"knowledge of the details of Art;" they "*know their*  
"*own incompetence*;" but they nevertheless still assume  
to be competent to pronounce the charges against the  
cleaning "exaggerated," and to impute "malevolence"  
to those who make them. Then, even Mr. Russell,  
the "*Commissioner of 1850 to report upon the state*  
"*of the National Pictures*," takes refuge in his *unpro-*  
*fessional* character, and refers you to "my friend," meekly  
protesting that he *himself* has "*no knowledge of Art*  
"that he could *venture* to ask you to rely on."\*

2. That no person should in future, *in virtue of any office*, become a  
Trustee of the National Gallery.

This Resolution is nothing less than *a vote of censure*  
upon the *actual* ex-officio Trustees. It ought to have  
been followed by a recommendation that the persons  
thus arraigned should be called upon to *resign*.

3. That the Trustees be appointed by the Treasury.

4. That it is expedient that the number of Trustees be diminished  
*as vacancies occur*.

If the number of Trustees was found to be greater  
than was compatible with an efficient administration of  
the Gallery, as here implied, it was the duty of the Com-

---

\* The following deserves attention, as showing the conscientious



mittee to recommend its *immediate* reduction. The re-

manner in which the four under-named Trustees have discharged their duty to the Public.

4583-5-6-90-2, 4714-6-8-24, 6235, &c. Sir C. Eastlake.] The cleaning of 'A View in Venice' has been carried *too far*; cleaning it *at all was unnecessary*; the lights have been *too much* cleaned; I am sure they would be better for *glazing* NOW. 'The Queen of Sheba' has been *ill* and *tastelessly* cleaned; the lights on the waves are *too light—too much cleaned*; we will say, *too cold* for the rest of the picture. The 'Sheba' is *NOW out of harmony*. I could not positively say *that TIME will restore it*. The pictures recently cleaned have been *over-cleaned*; softness of outlines *may* have been *destroyed* in some of them by *over-cleaning*. *They do very much want some of that dirt they had before, &c.*

4852, 4939-40. Mr. William Russell.] I have observed *defects* upon the surface of the pictures *since* they have been cleaned, which defects I had not observed *at all before*. In parts the recently cleaned pictures have been rendered *RAW*. I should be *very slow* to act on my *own* opinion as to the *mode* and *degree* in which cleaning should be carried on.

5072-7-5. Lord Monteagle.] I *admit* that with respect to a very favourite picture of mine, Sir George Beaumont's Claude, 'The Annunciation,' *the change is painful to my eye*. I loved that Claude better in its *former state than I do NOW*. I think the disagreeable change is the result of *the recent operation*. *I regret the alteration*.

5409. Lord Overstone]. I do not pretend to a critical knowledge of the *details* of Art. I am *rather cautious* in giving an opinion on points on which *my opinion is not worth having*.

At a Meeting of the Trustees of the National Gallery, held on Friday, the 12th of November 1852; Present, Sir C. Eastlake, Mr. William Russell, Lord Monteagle, Lord Overstone, &c.:—

Resolved, That the Trustees APPROVE of the result of their instructions on this head [*i.e.* the cleaning of the nine pictures in the preceding vacation], AS EVINCED IN THE IMPROVED APPEARANCE OF THE PICTURES, and of the MANNER IN WHICH THE OPERATIONS HAVE BEEN PERFORMED by Mr. Seguiet, under the superintendence of Mr. Uwins.

We have it upon the authority of Sir C. Eastlake, Mr. William

quirements of a Nation are not to be sacrificed to the convenience or sensibilities of individuals.

5. That the office of *Keeper* of the Gallery *be abolished*.

6. That a salaried *Director* should be appointed by the Treasury *for a definite period*; at the expiration of which he may be re-appointed.

In proposing to abolish the office of "Keeper" with its annual stipend of £200, and to appoint a "Director" "at a salary of not less than £1000 a year," the Committee seem to imply that they had in contemplation a chief of the National Gallery superior in dignity and power to the Keeper. But we have in the "Past Management," completely established by the evidence of various members of the Trust, including Sir C. Eastlake, ex-Keeper, what the Committee must have known full well; namely, that no functionary, *whatever*

Report,  
p. xvi.

4847, 5060, Russell, and Lord Montea-  
gle, that the Resolution of the 12th of No-  
vember, was *unanimous* as well as *unconditional*: and that before  
5070, 5939, passing it, the Trustees "went round the Gallery and *considered* the  
&c. "pictures." Lord Overstone gave no evidence upon the cleaning. He  
may therefore be dismissed with the remark, that had he possessed  
sufficient discernment to comprehend how *worthless* must have been  
his judgment upon a question involving, as it does, the *whole* of that,  
of whose *parts* he declares himself ignorant, he might have preserved  
his boasted "caution" unimpugned, and also have escaped the absurd  
contradiction of committing himself to an unconditional approval of  
the "*manner* in which the operations had been performed," and then  
disclaiming all "*pretension*" to *criticise details*. With regard to Sir  
C. Eastlake, Mr. William Russell, and Lord Montea-  
gle, although under the conviction, as their evidence *proves*, that the National pictures  
had been *injured* by the operations they had authorised, they never-  
theless joined in the "Resolution" that they had been *improved*. Their  
distinction without *difference*, between "*over-cleaning*," "*cleaning too*



*his title*, could be treated with greater deference, enjoy greater power, or lie under heavier RESPONSIBILITY than the KEEPER; his only rival in authority having been the President of the Royal Academy. Any *real* alteration therefore in the position of the chief officer of the Gallery, must involve a corresponding *diminution* not only of his influence, but of his RESPONSIBILITY, which is scarcely compatible with a five-fold augmentation of his emoluments. Their scheme then to abolish the office of "Keeper" and to appoint a "Director," is after all but a change of *words*. It has much the appearance of a clumsy device to get rid of Mr. Uwins by a *counterfeit* abolition of his office, *in order to evade urging his dismissal* as they *ought* to have done, on the ground of *proved incapacity*.

"*far*," "rendering *raw*," "inharmonious," "painful to the eye," &c., works by masters *renowned for harmony*—works until the late cleaning, remarkable for that quality—and *injuring* those works, will be received by no man of sense and candour but as a contemptible subterfuge. The Resolution approving of the cleaning was passed on the 12th of November 1852. On the 29th, *seventeen days later*, that appeal was made to the Public which first roused them to a sense of the "Vandalisms" that had been committed. But Mr. Russell, when asked by the Chairman whether, "*at the time that Resolution was passed*, the effects of the cleaning had been *prominently brought before the Public*," ingenuously replies, "*I do not know to what you allude*:" and the Chairman had to *inform* him that "there were *LETTERS IN THE PRESS* calling attention to the effects of the cleaning," before he "*should say*," or could "*think*, that there had been *no observations upon the cleaning in the public press so early as the 12th of November*." So little attention would Mr. Russell have us believe he had paid to those "*LETTERS IN THE PRESS*" which had caused the appointment of the Committee, and *compelled himself* to answer for his share in the defacement of National property.

Russell's  
Evid., 4850.  
4851.

The appointment of the "Director" for "a definite period" would serve little else than to maintain in the Directorship some incompetent creature of patronage, during whatever period might be defined, on the plea that his term of office had not expired; or to eject at the end of that period a competent, but not sufficiently *obsequious* Director. The tenure of office should depend *entirely on the efficiency of him who holds it*.\*

7 That every recommendation for the purchase of a picture should originate with the Director, *and be made in writing to the Trustees*.

The last clause of this Resolution imports that the Trustees are to have a *veto* upon the recommendations of their "Director." Men compelled to admit that their opinions on Art are "worth *very little*," that they possess "no knowledge that can be *relied on*;" who "do not *at all* set themselves up as judges of *what is calculated to improve or deteriorate the Taste of the Public*," are selected by the Committee as the most competent judges of this very question. The *Taste of the Trustees* is the standard by which the National Collection is to be augmented; a "Taste" exemplified in the neglect of classical works, in the purchase of spurious and otherwise offensive productions in their stead, and in congratulatory Resolutions at the defacement of Masterpieces. Such are the credentials of the Trustees as a Court of Appeal on matters of Art,—such the

Lord Mont-  
eagle's, Rus-  
sell's, and  
Lord Over-  
stone's Evid.  
5077, 4915,  
5398, &c.

---

\* The Committee suggest that their "Director" should be appointed "for a term of at least five years, and that he should receive a salary "of *not less than £1000 a year*."



“disinterested *services*” which make the *Committee* Report, p. xiv.  
 “sensible of the obligation under which the *Public* lie  
 “to the Trustees.”

No professional man of intelligence and spirit,—and such alone is fit to preside over the National Gallery,—could submit to even the remotest chance of his views being negatived by an *unprofessional Board*. None but such as possess *neither self-respect nor reputation to lose*, would accept the Directorship on such terms. But there are also other grounds for objecting to this Resolution. Were the Director, every time he wished to secure a picture, under the obligation to disclose his intention to several persons and await their decision, instead of applying at once to the Treasury, we must be prepared to forego the advantages of secrecy and promptness of action; which, in such transactions are often indispensable *both to economy and to success*.

8 That a fixed sum should be annually proposed to Parliament for the purchase of pictures, *and placed at the disposal of the Trustees*.

The last clause, the main one of this Resolution, is but a repetition of the last clause of the *seventh*. For if the Trustees are to have a veto upon “every recommendation” of the “Director,” the money assigned to the purchase of pictures, whether it be a “fixed” annual sum, or voted for the occasion, must necessarily be at their “disposal.”

We PROTEST against the Report in regard to the *future* Management of the National Gallery, because, while it charges on the past system of management the abuses which necessitated the recent inquiry, it recommends that the *same* system “should be continued.” Report, pp. iii & xiv.

## THE SITE OF THE NATIONAL GALLERY.

WE PROTEST against the Report in regard to its conclusions respecting the present Site of the National Gallery ; and we PROTEST not less against *the mode* in which the Committee conducted the examination of witnesses on this subject,\* as having been characterised by a predetermination to urge the removal of the Gallery, in order to promote, first, the notorious project of the Royal Academy to eject the National pictures so as to secure the whole of the building in Trafalgar Square to themselves, and secondly, an extravagant scheme for transporting to the outskirts of the Metropolis, and combining under one roof, the National Gallery, the various Archæological Collections at the British Museum, the Sculpture, &c. ; a scheme which has for one of its fundamental dogmas, as its projectors announce, that *excellence* in Art should be subordinate to *chronological arrangement* : which scheme therefore, if carried out, besides rendering *all* those Collections comparatively unavailable *from difficulty of access*, would, as regards the National Gallery,

Report, p. xv.  
xviii.

Davis's Pro-  
test, *Times*  
and *Morning*  
*Post*, May  
31st, 1853.

---

\* It is not on the question of Site alone that *the mode* of examination pursued by the Committee was condemnable. Throughout the inquiry they demeaned themselves as the partizans of a cabal. They inaugurated their sittings with the announcement that evidence would not be received that "tended to implicate the Royal Academy." Thus, although appointed by the Nation as arbitrators between the Royal Academy and their accusers—we say *the Royal Academy*, for although only two Royal Academicians had perpetrated, they had *all* tacitly abetted the "cleaning"—the Committee virtually became counsel for the accused, and thereby pledged to do their best to avert their conviction.



defeat the main object for which that Institution was founded; namely, the cultivation of the HIGHEST EXCELLENCE in Art.

But the ostensible ground of the Committee for their recommendation to remove the Gallery, "to some more  
 "suitable locality," as they say, which they couple with a  
 declaration that "the present spot certainly possesses, in  
 "a high degree, the merits of being *central* and *acces-*  
 "*sible*,"—indeed, that "it is *unrivalled* as a central  
 "position,"—is, that "THE COMMISSION APPOINTED IN  
 "1850 TO REPORT ON THE STATE OF THE PICTURES,"  
 "expressed an opinion adverse to the construction of a  
 "new Gallery in the same situation, chiefly on account  
 "of its exposure to smoke, dust, idle crowds, and *other*  
 "*influences unfavourable to the preservation of pictures.*"  
 This "adverse opinion," the Public are expected to receive  
 as conclusive against the present Site; yet the very first  
 page of that Commission's Report announces what  
 ought to have made the Committee doubt the policy  
 of using that argument. The Commissioners of 1850  
 there say: "in such examination of the building and  
 "of the paintings as appeared to be requisite, we  
 "had the full advantage of the experience and accu-  
 "rate observation of Mr. UWINS, the Keeper of the  
 "Gallery, who communicated to us the most ample in-  
 "formation, and afforded us every assistance."

Report,  
p. xvii.

Report,  
p. xvi.

Report,  
p. xvii.

Report, pp.  
xvi. & xvii.

Rep. of Sel.  
Com. on the  
Nat. Gal. of  
1850, App.  
p. 67.

It now behoves us to show what will be found of singular importance to this subject; namely, *the nature* of that authority which having for *its* authority, "the  
 "experience, accurate observation, ample information,  
 "and assistance," on a question of ancient pictures, of

one who has taken so prominent a part *in disfiguring them*, is now, in its turn, brought forward by the Committee as *their* authority for recommending THE REMOVAL OF THE NATIONAL GALLERY from "an unrivalled central Site."

#### THE COMMISSION OF 1850.

##### ORIGIN OF THE COMMISSION.

Hurlstone's  
Evid. 6727-  
9-30-1.

The Commission of 1850 was appointed at the instigation of the Royal Academy. In a Letter which Sir C. Eastlake addressed to the late Sir Robert Peel, the writer insinuated that the present Site of the Gallery was injurious to Paintings. This Letter was followed, it is affirmed, by a Memorial to Her Majesty, also from Sir C. Eastlake, praying that the entire building in Trafalgar Square might be given up to the Royal Academy, to be used by them as a depository, not only for several valuable ancient paintings of their own, and other works of the same class annually lent to them, although these are necessarily as susceptible of injury from impure atmosphere as the National pictures themselves, but also for pictures *recently* painted, which, from this circumstance, are infinitely more liable to suffer from atmospheric influences.

The Letter to Sir Robert Peel and the Memorial to the Queen are therefore in contradiction to each other.

The Commission of 1850 was limited to three members; namely, Mr. Faraday, Mr. William Russell, and Sir C. Eastlake, the most active promoter of its appointment.



MR. FARADAY, ON THE REMOVAL OF THE NATIONAL  
GALLERY.

In reply to question 5446, page 373 of the Blue Book, Mr. Faraday states that “mastic varnish, where “it is properly applied to the surface of pictures, and “where it is not drawn apart by any contraction of the “painting beneath, is a *perfect defender* of the surfaces “which it covers, from the bad action either of sulphu- “retted atmosphere, or the other substances which may “float around.” In support of this, he informs us that he “covered a new canvas with three coats of white 5447. “lead”—one of the most changeable of pigments—“to “represent the surface of a picture;” that, “over this he “applied the varnish, first one coat, then another over “three-fourths, then a third over two-fourths, then a “fourth over one-fourth;” that, “the surface of the canvas “being so prepared, it was put into a box where the “atmosphere was continually charged with SULPHURETTED “HYDROGEN,” which, he says, he “used, *because whatever* 5525. “*holds good as to THAT, would hold good, in respect of pe-* “*netration, of ANY OTHER injurious quality in the atmos-* “*phere;*” that, “there it was subjected to that bad “atmosphere from the 4th of November, to the end of “that year, 1850;” that, notwithstanding this violent ordeal, “the effect upon the surface of the canvas was “*absolutely nothing* where the varnish was perfect; “even where there was but a *single coating*, except where “contraction of the surface had taken place, so as to cause “cracks;” that, “there the deleterious agent had pene- “trated, and had produced a mapping out of fine black

5460. "lines, wherever a crack had occurred ;" but that he had  
 "no doubt these fine black lines could be easily removed  
 "by rubbing with a soft cloth ; they were exceedingly  
 'superficial.'"

If then, a pigment in itself peculiarly susceptible of injury from impure atmosphere, a pigment, moreover, recently applied, and on that account still more susceptible of such injury, may, even when defended by only "a single coating of varnish," be made the subject of an experiment such as the one Mr. Faraday has described, without any worse effect than can be "easily removed by rubbing with a soft cloth," there is ample proof that the National pictures incur no danger from the present Site, since they are not only *not* "subjected in a box to an atmosphere continually charged with sulphuretted hydrogen," but are protected both by repeated "coatings of varnish," and by the *induration of age*.

Mr. Faraday's experiment therefore is an argument *in favour* of the present Site.

5469. It is strange that after the harmless result of an experiment so extreme in its character, as to be altogether inadmissible as a subject for comparison with the atmospheric condition of any inhabitable spot, Mr. Faraday should still have hazarded the opinion, that "the Site of a Gallery in the centre of London peculiarly exposes pictures to damage." We can account for this singular disagreement between experiment and opinion, only on the supposition that Mr. Faraday must have been misled by the self-sufficient assertions of Mr. W. Russell, and the *interested* misrepresentations of Sir C. Eastlake, that



the National pictures had actually deteriorated in appearance, as compared with works by the same masters in other Galleries.

But, besides Mr. Faraday's own experiment, we can oppose to his opinion, Sir David Brewster's testimony to the "*perfect state*" of some of the *uncleaned* pictures which have been longest in the Gallery,\* and other evidence of not less weight. It is well known to all who have enjoyed the means of comparison, that such of our National pictures as have escaped the repeated application of that noxious compound of boiled oil, litharge, and varnish, called the "Gallery varnish," and the violent operations of the Royal Academicians, Eastlake and Uwins, present the same hue, and otherwise retain the same satisfactory condition, as any *undefiled* and *unmuti-*  
*lated* works by the same masters in Galleries situated under the most favoured climates.

2917, 2921,  
2925, 2926,  
2945, 2948,  
&c.

It is especially worthy of notice that Mr. Faraday leaves *the only admissible argument* for banishing the National Gallery to a remote locality, namely, *a deterioration in the appearance of the pictures clearly arising*

---

\* The 'Cephalus and Procris' ('A Pastoral Landscape with Figures,' No. 2, in the Catalogue,) which Sir David Brewster quotes as "a perfect Claude," is strictly such as he describes it. This picture, one of the Angerstein collection purchased in 1824, has been in the present Gallery ever since it was erected. Its perfect preservation therefore, besides being a severe commentary upon the recent treatment of the 'Sheba,' the 'Rebecca,' and the 'Annunciation,' is of itself sufficient to refute the fallacy originated and fostered by the Royal Academy, that "the present Site of the National Gallery is unfavourable to the preservation of pictures," the main argument the Committee adduce in support of their recommendation for its removal.

5564, &c.  
& Protest,  
p. 34.

from THE PRESENT SITE, precisely where he found it. On this point, although upon it turns *the whole question of REMOVAL*, he emphatically declares himself unable to form a judgment; and, with great candour, repeatedly disclaims in the course of his evidence, any pretension to decide on questions of *Art*. He tells us that he “can form *no judgment* with respect to the alteration of colour, the attraction of dirt, *the nature of what is called dirt*,” &c., on the pictures he examined, and that he has “*not the slightest means of knowing whether a tint is of ancient, or of modern date*;” nor “whether any change which may be observable in pictures, is a change of the colour of the varnish by *time, or whether it is a colour put on by the artist*;” as he “could not undertake to say *what the artist had put there originally*, or what would pass as his glazing, or where the varnish ceases and the glazing begins—his idea of the composition of an oil picture being very confused.” He further states that “in the Report of the Commission of 1850, he left matters of this kind”—that is, of *Art*—“to Mr. William Russell and Sir C. Eastlake,” and that “each member was responsible for *his own judgment only*;” his having been limited to the atmospheric influences to which the Gallery was exposed; *those same influences which he has proved to be innoxious*, and so reduced the question of REMOVAL, to the plain, but important one, of *ventilation*.

Therefore, since Mr. Faraday declares that he has not the slightest means of knowing whether a tint is of *ancient* or of *modern date*, and that he can form *no judgment* as to *the nature* of what his two fellow Com-



missioners call "*dirt*," nor whether the colour which he now sees on the National pictures is, or is not, *the colour originally put on by the artist*; since by these, and many other like admissions, he entirely repudiates being a party to the assertion that *THE PRESENT SITE of the Gallery has actually been detrimental to their appearance*, Mr. William Russell and Sir C. Eastlake are *the sole authors* of the statement in the Report of the Commission of 1850, that "many of the pictures present  
 "the appearance of being covered with a thick film,  
 "*alike foreign in feature and in colour to their original*  
 "*character*, detracting from their highest qualities, and  
 "depriving them for the time of clearness and brilliancy;" and that their "dirty and obscure state is caused by  
 "the impure mass of *animal and ammoniacal vapour*  
 "produced by the *respiration* and *perspiration* of great  
 "numbers of persons," and other sinister influences *arising from THE PRESENT SITE of the Gallery*.

Rep. of Sel.  
 Com. on the  
 Nat. Gal. of  
 1850, App.  
 p. 68.

Mr. William Russell and Sir C. Eastlake then are virtually "The Commission of 1850:" *theirs alone* is that "adverse opinion," upon which the Committee found their recommendation for *THE REMOVAL OF THE NATIONAL GALLERY*.

#### MR. WILLIAM RUSSELL "AN AUTHORITY" FOR THE REMOVAL OF THE NATIONAL GALLERY.

We have charged Mr. William Russell, though without prejudice, be it remembered, to *THE PARAMOUNT RESPONSIBILITY OF THE PROFESSIONAL CHIEFS* of the Gallery, with having been a principal instigator of the

Lord Aberdeen's Evid.  
 5284, and  
 Protest, p. 53.

Protest pp.  
11, 19, 35,  
&c.

Protest pp.  
20, & 21.

Report,  
p. xvi. & xvii.

recent cleaning operations.\* We should have been content had the rebuke administered to him by the witnesses, in their all but *unanimous* condemnation of those operations, left us free to dismiss him without further comment. But the Committee must needs foist him upon the Public as "an authority" for that project of evil omen to Art in England, the removal of the National Gallery,—of the only barrier Art has here to oppose to the encroachments of Academic artifice. Under these circumstances, we deem it necessary to give the Public a detailed account of his proceedings in connection with the operations he was so active in instigating, as the very best means of showing how far he deserves the pedestal upon which, by his own consent, the Committee have placed him. In doing this, we shall be guided by "an authority," whose infallibility Mr. Russell himself would be the last to impugn. To borrow an expression of his *own*, we "shall be  
4826. "very glad to give a short outline of the course he "took," and of the qualifications upon which he grounds his interference, as nearly as possible, in his own words. Thus, by leaving him to tell his own tale, he will be saved the necessity of *again* complaining of

---

\* Mr. William Russell's officiousness is no palliation for Sir C. Eastlake or Mr. Uwins. Had these Royal Academicians been *competent* for their positions, Mr. Russell would long since have received  
5284. from *them* the rebuke implied by LORD ABERDEEN; namely, that the Trustees should "limit" themselves "to what are the *proper*  
5328. "functions of Trustees; and should not *interfere with details*, such, "for instance, as *the cleaning*."



“unfounded attack and illiberal censure,” while the Public will learn at the fountain-head, how to appreciate his protestation, that “he does not willingly make any *“gratuitous suggestions;”* how to value his opinion as to *what* “appearance” the Great Masters *ought* to “present;” and thence how to rate him as “AN AUTHORITY” for the “Removal of the National Gallery.”

Russell's Letter, Min. of Trust, of 1847-52, p. 27.

The passage from the Report of the so-called “Commission of 1850,” with which we have concluded our analysis of Mr. Faraday's evidence, Mr. William Russell quotes to the Committee, as of great weight. “Although you are probably more or less familiar with this passage,” says he, “I beg to draw your attention to it”—“the names of Sir C. Eastlake and MYSELF are to it;”\* and that nothing shall interfere with his “animal vapour and perspiration,” he abstains from any allusion to “cleaning,” or “Gallery varnish.” “The Report of the Commission,” he informs us, “is dated “the 24th of May, 1850. In August 1850, MY name,” he continues, “was added to the list of Trustees.” On

Protest, p. 85.

4826.

Protest, p. 85.

---

\* Mr. W. Russell says, “the names of Sir C. Eastlake and “Mr. Faraday and myself, &c.” To further their own schemes, both Sir C. Eastlake and Mr. Russell do their utmost to identify Mr. Faraday with *their* assertion that the National Pictures *have deteriorated in appearance*; instinctively feeling that it required *his* name to give it respectability. Mr. Faraday, however, flatly refuses to endorse it. He says: “I left matters of *this* kind”—*i. e.* of *Art*—to Sir C. Eastlake and Mr. Russell; “I can form *no judgment* upon “them,” &c. We therefore adhere to the distinction so emphatically laid down by Mr. Faraday himself, and fix exclusively on Sir C. Eastlake and Mr. Russell, the judgments which Mr. Faraday declares belong to them *alone*.

Analysis of Faraday's Evid. Protest, pp. 81-85.

Min of Trust.  
1847-52, p.  
35, and Blue  
Book, 4826.

the 4th of April 1851, as early as the *third* meeting he attends in his new capacity, we find him already deep in his agitation for the "cleaning." "The Great Exhibition," he says, "was about to open." "It occurred very strongly to *me*," he proceeds, "that the condition of the pictures was very little creditable to the Country and to the Trustees of the National Gallery, and that it was *exceedingly unfair* to those who were coming from all parts of the world, that they should see them in that condition; there was not much time to be lost, and therefore it seemed to *me* to be desirable to select some pictures that were most unfavourable in their condition, and to *propose*"—though unwilling to make *gratuitous* suggestions—"that they should be *improved in their appearance*; accordingly, you will find that *I requested* the Trustees"—not *gratuitously*—"to take into consideration *the propriety* of causing certain pictures to be cleaned at an early period," &c. It had devolved upon Mr. WILLIAM RUSSELL to vindicate to the "coming" world, the National Taste! The Trustees "Resolved," however "that the cleaning of these pictures be postponed:" some of them, and *Sir C. Eastlake* among the number, "having rather a strong recollection," as Mr. Russell suspects, "of what had passed on a former occasion—in 1846—might have been very unwilling *again* to encounter the amount of attack that *possibly* might be made upon them"—the Public *might* "strongly feel the change in the pictures." "*I acquiesced*," modestly adds Mr. Russell, in that Resolution of the Trustees, &c. So the doomed Masterpieces obtained a respite, and we

4831.

4826.



—*save for the defacements of 1846*—should have escaped appearing, in the eyes of “those” who came from all “parts of the world,” as a horde of barbarians, who, if they dole a portion of their superfluous gold on works of genius, do so, not from any appreciation of their worth, but to mutilate them until fashioned to their own fantastic notions.

But, “The Resolution of the Trustees,” says Mr. Russell, was “not rejection, but *postponement*.” On the 9th of February 1852, at the very first meeting the Trustees held in that year, Mr. Russell agitates for the cleaning with unabated vigour. If the Public *should* “strongly feel the change,” *he* was there to “encounter” the “amount of attack that possibly might be made upon “them.” “You may assume,” says he to the Committee, “it was not likely that the pictures would become *more* “brilliant in 1851.” With increased zest he returns to his “animal vapours and perspiration,” and would fain establish an argument for the removal of the Gallery, by assertions which, if somewhat deficient in that regard for *fact* which beseems an Accountant-General of the Court of Chancery,\* exhibit a pleasantness of conception and an elegance of expression not less flattering to the *English*

Min. of  
Trust. of  
1847-52,  
p. 41

---

\* Besides discharging the “duties” of a Trustee of the National Gallery, Mr. Russell fills the ill-requited office of Accountant-General of the Court of Chancery. But he threatens us with his resignation of the former post—with the loss of those “disinterested services,” of which the Committee are so “sensible” on behalf of “the Public.” “I was “willing to undertake the office of Trustee,” says Mr. Russell, but, “I should not be able—I should not have the leisure—to *continue* “in that character.”

Report,  
p. xiv.  
4783.  
8084.

Public, than to the six other Nations he honours with  
 4826. his notice. "*We had the COMBINED ammoniacal exhalations of Russia, Austria, France, Italy, Belgium, and America condensed upon the pictures, SUPERVENING UPON OUR OWN NATIONAL EXHALATIONS,*" says this colleague of Sir C. Eastlake, "and *I think at the close of that year, the pictures became in as bad a state as it*  
 4820. "*was possible for any pictures to be in. I thought it very desirable to introduce a more effectual state of things in respect to the administration of the National Gallery. I fancied the pictures were becoming more and more dim. I could not see them myself, and I thought it very probable that the Public could not*  
 4865. "*see them either. My view was, that the pictures*  
 4826. "*were not visible as they then were. I am speaking of my own impression, not as a matter of Art, but as to the general appearance and visibility in the pictures.*" It had never occurred to this Commissioner-Trustee, to this "Authority" for the "appearance" of pictures, that "the general appearance" of a work of Art could be "a matter of Art," still less, that it was *the whole question of Art itself*. The "cleaning" then was resolved upon, "*not as a matter of Art,*" but to humour the "fancies" and "impressions" of Mr. William Russell. Thus much of "the course" this Commissioner-Trustee "took" to induce the "cleaning;" thus much of his "not willingly making any gratuitous suggestions." We now come to his opinions upon the operations he was so active in organizing, and to the arguments with which he "encounters the attack" which had loomed on his horizon.



In his evidence on the recent picture-cleaning, Mr. Russell says: "As far as I am able to judge, FULL 4866. "JUSTICE has been done to the nine pictures, and "no damage has been done to any one of them; it "is my opinion that the operation has been performed "in a satisfactory manner, and that the pictures 4897. "are greatly improved by the process. I do not say "they might not have been more improved, but I think 4898. "they are considerably improved. I think there is no "EVIDENCE WHATEVER to show that any injury at all 4904. "has been inflicted upon them by the recent process. "But if you ask my own opinion, I think it possible "that in some places, in the 'Queen of Sheba' and "the other pictures, where particular parts have been "rendered RAW,"—that is, where Claude, a master re- 4852. nowned for mellowness and harmony, has been rendered raw, without any injury at all,—"it is the honesty "and sincerity of their cleaning, that gives to the pictures "their present appearance—the cleaning has been "somewhat too honest. I consider Claude's 'Sheba' 4905-9. "now in a preferable state to his 'St. Ursula;' I think "the 'St. Ursula' would be the better for being cleaned." Hence the Public may conclude that Mr. Russell stands pledged to reduce the 'St. Ursula' to his "preferable "state" of the mangled 'Sheba.' He further says; "it is my belief that the defects which are now ob- 4944. "servable in the cleaned pictures—which defects I "had not observed at all before—are not attributable "to the late cleaning. This belief I found merely on my "great confidence in the skill and care of Mr. SEGUIER," 4940-5. —on that "skill and care," let the Public bear in mind, which the witnesses, by ONE HUNDRED AND FORTY

Protest, p. 20. DECISIONS OUT OF ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY-FOUR, have condemned as *ignorance* and *recklessness*. It is this mass of evidence, to say nothing of the mutilated pictures themselves, that Mr. William Russell, not content with pronouncing it outweighed by the testimony of his "Lady," his "Marquis," his "three Dukes," and his "AUTHORISED REPORT signed by the Master of the Household from Osborne," in almost the very same breath in which he admits that he has *no opinion of his own*, contemptuously stigmatizes as "NO EVIDENCE WHATEVER."\*

---

\* We have here another notable example of the Committee's impartiality. Mr. Morris Moore pronounces "worthless" the evidence of seven witnesses; but not until after he had been *repeatedly provoked* by the Chairman to give his opinion, and *not without stating his reasons*. The Committee seize upon the expressions so extorted, and deliberately charge him with having stated that "the evidence given by *almost every witness*"—by "almost" *fifty-eight* witnesses—"is worth-*less*:" thereby inciting against him the animosity of *all* these witnesses, and the prejudices of every one else. Mr. William Russell, on the other hand, without his opinion having been asked, and possessing, as he owns, neither reasons to give, nor "any knowledge fit to be relied on," denounces as "NO EVIDENCE WHATEVER," that is, as *worthless*, the evidence of more or less all the witnesses—Messrs. Uwins and Segnier excepted—who had been examined upon the cleaning previously to himself. These witnesses were *twenty-three* in number. They include his six Academical allies, Hart, Roberts, Stanfield, Dyce, his fellow Commissioner and fellow Trustee, Sir C. Eastlake, P. R. A., and his "much valued friend," Sir E. Landseer, of whom he says; "we *all* know that he is capable of painting such pictures as probably *NO MAN BEFORE* was ever able to paint." But the Committee take no exception to Mr. Russell; on the contrary, in spite of his protestations of ignorance, they quote him as a final "authority" on the "appearance" of Masterpieces, that is, on *Art*, and therewith endorse his insolent censure.



The following extracts from Mr. Seguer's evidence, will reveal to the Public the *true* cause of the "obscured" "state" of some of the pictures, the worth of Mr. Russell's "great confidence in the skill and care of Mr. "Seguer," and the amount of *discernment* he brought to "the Commission of 1850."

SEGUIER (the Cleaner) *v.* HIMSELF.

771, 2925-95, &c. *Seguer.*]

When the pictures first came to the Gallery, they were not in a bad state. They were in a fine condition. There was NO OIL or dirt upon them.

2928-56. *Seguer.*] *I do not think that boiled oil and varnish, my "Gallery Varnish," tends to assume a brown or obscure colour to a greater extent than mastic varnish. I have NEVER KNOWN the composition of MASTIC VARNISH.*

643-7, 2915-7-25-7, 3212. *I do think that oil varnish has a greater tendency to discolour than mastic varnish, BUT I HAVE ENTERTAINED AND ACTED UPON A CONTRARY OPINION ALL MY LIFE. I have been in the habit of varnishing pictures with a mixture of boiled oil and varnish, my "Gallery Varnish,"—magylp—PARTICULARLY DARK AND ABSORBENT PICTURES.\* It is my opinion that this oil varnish has a great tendency to attract dirt, and that if it continue any length of time on a picture, it will get yellower and blacker from day to day.*

---

\* Mr. Seguer cares not to what extent he incriminates himself, or how he exposes his own ignorance, provided he can see even the most meagre chance of invalidating the charges against the cleaning. Throughout his evidence he labours to produce the impression that, in their former state, the nine recently cleaned pictures were "invisible" from accumulated coatings of matter that "gets yellower and blacker 3212. "from day to day." Why, "I rubbed those coatings in *myself!*" he 2942-3, &c.

## SEGUIER (the Cleaner) v. HIMSELF.

2932. I *do* think that pictures covered with *mastic* varnish will become quite as yellow and dark as pictures which have been covered with *mixed* varnish.

2945-6-7-8. I *do not* think that a coat of pure *mastic* varnish would have accumulated the same amount of dirt that my successive coats of *oil* and *mixed* varnish have done. I

- says. But he also tells us that he adopts the *blackening* process "*particularly*" in the case of "*dark* pictures." We appreciate the *admission*, but were already aware of the *fact*. That admission coincides with our own ocular experience of the character of his proceedings. Ignorant or reckless of the consequence, he has been "in the habit" of repeatedly besmearing with his "Gallery varnish" the deeper toned pictures—the very works which, being already *dark*, would become *still darker* from such treatment—and then "*rubbing in* other coats of oil" upon *that*; thus purchasing a temporary "bearing out," at the cost of *increased permanent darkness*; while light toned pictures, such, for instance, as Claude's 'Cephalus and Procris,' (No. 2 in the Catalogue), and the 'St. Ursula,' have escaped the pollution of his blackening mixture, not from an *intentional* forbearance on the part of this very "skilful," very "careful," very "experienced," and very "discreet" person, but merely because their superior "visibility" incidental to their lightness of tone, presented a natural barrier to his mischievous tamperings. Of the nine pictures recently cleaned, only *two*, namely, the Nicholas Poussin, and the Guercino, were "*dark* pictures;" if the former, in which all the objects were very distinct, may be so called. The 'Queen of Sheba,' before it was cleaned, was in every respect, in as fine a state as its twin Masterpiece, the 'St. Ursula,' is *now*. Mr. Segulier, however, "thinks the 'St. Ursula,' *would be improved by* cleaning:" "it would be more pleasing to *me*," he says, "not perhaps to the *Public*; for *the Public*," he observes, "often mistake *obscurity* for *beauty*." He "considers that the 'St. Ursula' is, to a certain extent, a good deal *obscured*, and that the 'Queen of Sheba' is now in a preferable state."

With this declaration on his lips we leave him; content to stake the justice of the charges respecting *the cleaning*, against the accuracy of *that judgment*.

Protest,  
pp. 93-95.

764.

856.

726.



SEGUIER (the Cleaner) v. HIMSELF.

think that the extremely dirty state of the pictures is *mainly owing to the manner in which they have been varnished* BY MYSELF or my brother, with "*mixed varnish*," and occasionally *rubbing them up with oil afterwards*. These exterior coats of oil varnish, my "Gallery Varnish," and the oil that had been *put to it, had accumulated a vast mass of dirt*.

905. I think *the very bad atmosphere of the present National Gallery* SUFFICIENTLY ACCOUNTS for the extremely obscure state of the pictures.

3033. The oil or *mixed varnish*, WHICH I HAD LAID ON MYSELF, has been the MAIN SOURCE of accumulating that vast quantity of dirt, which I have described upon the surface of the pictures.

We have given only a taste of that "long experience Report, p. xi. "and professional ability," that "very great skill, very 4837. "great care," and *very great "discretion,"* upon which 4843. "*every painter in the Academy*," the Committee, and Mr. Protest, William Russell, have agreed to place their "fullest pp. 26 & 35. "reliance:" enough, however, to teach the Public *where to look* for the cause of any obscurity that may disfigure the National pictures.

But Mr. Russell has other resources *besides* his "great "confidence in the very great skill, very great care, "and very long experience of Mr. Segulier." He possesses a knowledge of Art rarely met with out of the Royal Academy. He says: "whether the ancient "Masters, and Claude amongst them, had recourse to 4914. "a system of what is called *glazing* in painting, is a point

4915. "on which *I would rather decline giving any opinion.*
4902. "I am not an artist *at all*. I might very ill explain precise "points. I would *rather* not go into details of the "pictures; but *my friend*, LORD NORTHAMPTON, who "is a *very successful* and a *very experienced* artist, I dare "say will give *any* further information that may be "desired on these points; and if the Honourable "Member (Mr. Charteris) *will allow me to say so*, I should "be *very* unwilling to embark on any *artistic* disserta- "tion on *points* in the pictures; I would *really rather* "MYSELF not embark in them. I have no knowledge
4915. "which I could *venture* to ask the Committee to rely on, "*whether the* VENETIAN SCHOOL, or CLAUDE, *glazed or* "not." This last is a plain admission that Mr. Russell does not know *what glazing is*.\*

The charge that several of the National pictures had been irretrievably damaged by *the removal of their original glazing* caused the appointment of the Committee. Mr. Russell denies that *any portion of the original work* has been removed in *any* case, though when questioned upon the subject of *glazing*, he is compelled to admit that he has no knowledge of what

---

\* The judgment which Mr. William Russell here passes upon his own *artistic attainments*, he might extend to his proficiency as an expounder of *public duty*, as will be seen by what follows:—

#### WILLIAM RUSSELL v. HIMSELF.

4813. William Russell]. The very office of Mr. Uwins CERTAINLY implied that he should take part in our discussions, and give his opinion on matters in connexion with the ques-
- 4803-4-5. William Russell]. I do not consider that Mr. Uwins has committed a breach of duty, as far as I know, in not having stated his grounds of disapprobation, if he did



*glazing* is. He has complained of “*unfounded* attack and “*illiberal* censure.” Let the Nation judge upon whom should rest that stigma ; whether upon those, who, inspired by a high sense of public duty, by their zeal for Art, and incurring no mean responsibility, who, armed with reasons so cogent for all they advance, that to suppress them, the Committee, in their sympathy for a defeated faction, disdain not even the most unworthy expedients, come forward to denounce to the Nation the defacement of their Masterpieces ; or upon him, who, being by his own admission incompetent to determine the absence or presence of that whose removal is the main issue upon which the accusers stake the justice of their impeachment ; who, having nothing better to redeem his self-

---

tion of *cleaning*, although his opinion was not specially asked. . not approve of the *cleaning*. I would rather not be asked to express an opinion as to what Mr. Uwins *ought* to have done. What it might have been his *duty* to do if he entertained another opinion, I leave for *others* to judge. It never *occurred to me* to consider whether or not, if he *had* entertained a contrary opinion, it would have been his *duty* to *express* that opinion to the Trustees.

By which the Public are to understand that Mr. William Russell, himself a public officer, either cannot, or *will* not say, whether another public officer whose “very office,” he says, demands that he should give his opinion *spontaneously* upon a certain subject, and that subject the greatest within his jurisdiction, has or has not “committed a breach “of duty” by *withholding that opinion*. As to its “*never having occurred*” to him “to consider” the matter, we leave the Public to fix the category to which *that* statement belongs.

confessed ignorance, than a "belief" founded "*merely*" "on the great skill and great care" of a picture-cleaner unacquainted with even the commonest details and materials of his trade,\* and on the "experience" of a titled *dilettante* "friend" likewise involved in the indictment,† takes upon himself, nevertheless, to pronounce that those Masterpieces have not been shorn of even the least portion of the disputed substance.

Such are Mr. William Russell's qualifications as "a Commissioner, to report upon the state of the National Pictures;" such the foundation upon which rests *one* half of the "authority" the Committee advance as *their* authority for the removal of the National Gallery. We will now dispose of the other.

SIR C. EASTLAKE, P.R.A., "AN AUTHORITY" FOR THE  
REMOVAL OF THE NATIONAL GALLERY.

With regard to the *other half* of the "Commission of

Rep. p. xi.

\* Mr. Segquier, whose "long experience and professional ability" are  
2956. guaranteed by the Committee, not only says that he has "never

781. "known the composition of *mastic varnish*," but declares that "PURE

871, 3030. "SPIRITS OF WINE, if applied to the surface of an old picture—of a  
"picture more than ten years old—WILL NOT AFFECT IT!" It may

3031. be as well to mention that Mr. Segquier stated in his evidence, that it  
was *he* who "cleaned" Lord Carlisle's *once* magnificent Portrait of  
Snyders, by Van Dyck, the ghastly and half rubbed-out appearance of  
which so shocked every one who saw it, when exhibited at the British  
Institution in 1851.

Min. of  
Trust. of  
Nov. 1852,  
Blue Book,  
App. No. III,  
p. 744.

† Lord Northampton is one of the Trustees who assisted at the  
passing of the unconditional and *unanimous* resolution on the 12th of  
November, 1852, approving of the recent "cleaning," and of the  
"manner" in which the operation had been performed.



1850," Sir C. Eastlake, it is notorious that from his purchase of that wretched picture, 'The Youthful Christ embracing St. John,' which, with full power given him by Sir Robert Peel, he, as Keeper, deliberately selected at Jeremiah Harman's sale, as "*an advisable acquisition for the National Gallery*,"\* down to his proceedings as *professional Trustee*—proceedings which include his unconditional approval of the recent picture-cleaning, his recantation of that approval, and the opinions, suggestions, and admissions in his evidence,

Min. of Trustees of 1844, Blue Book, App. No. II, pp. 741-2.

Blue Book, App. No. III, p. 74.

\* "The Minutes of the Trustees" inform us that this production was purchased at the express "recommendation" of *Sir C. Eastlake*, and that the very same day on which it was "secured" for "*four hundred and nine pounds ten shillings*," he made the spirited bid of "*two hundred and fifty pounds* for the 'Virgin and Child with Saints,'" by Michael Angelo; the loss of which, at that price, so "greatly disappointed" him, as to make him, he "confesses," "*not sufficiently attentive* in the matter of the 'HOLBEIN'—*that*," says he, "threw me off my guard." But whatever its merits, Sir C. Eastlake reckons upon turning his "Youthful Saviour, &c.," to account. He declares that "there is *scarcely* a picture which has been purchased"—he does not *name* the exception—"which will not fill some *important place* in the *series*," that is, in the scheme in which *Art* is to cut so distinguished a figure with *chronological arrangement*—"THE PLAN," which he says, "His Royal Highness Prince Albert conceived"—that plan in which "The Italian School," as Colonel Grey's letter BY COMMAND announces, "has been kindly arranged by *Sir C. Eastlake*, and, under his *superintendence*, the details of the German"—which includes *Holbein*—"and other schools have been chiefly worked out by Mr. *Wornum*." "If there had been such a list or plan as *that*," observes Sir C. Eastlake, "the Trustees *might have bought*,"—what?—why, says he, by way of proving its indispensableness, and bribing the Public to adopt it, they "might have bought *precisely*," the word is really *his*—"the pictures they *have bought*."

Min. of Trustees of 1844, Blue Book, App. No. II, p. 742.

Protest, p. 59.

6186.

6180.

6073.

Protest, p. 78.

6071.

Blue Book, App. No. XVII, p. 791.

6073.

4586. that "the cleaning," even where "carried *too far*," has not removed "*any portion of the master's work*;" that  
 4590. *no* glazings have been removed from the Claudes,  
 4722-52. *although* he is "not sufficiently acquainted with Claude's practice to say whether they had ever *had* glazings;"\* that  
 4508. "dirt has the effect of glazing, and is *quite as good* some-  
 4723. "times; that *dust* or *dirt* rubbed over a picture, will "do great good and much improve it," when "softness  
 4724. "of outlines has been *destroyed by over-cleaning*;" that Claude's touch is "wooden," which he first calls a  
 4728. "defect," and then *doubts* whether "it *be* a defect;"  
 4592. that where that "woodenness" of Claude is "concealed  
 4732-7. "and broken," he "*cannot tell* whether the *master* did, or "*time* did, or *dirt* did," something which did away with

---

\* The following is a further exemplification of Sir C. Eastlake's "consummate knowledge of Art," and consummate *veracity*.

#### SIR C. EASTLAKE P.R.A. v. HIMSELF.

##### FIRST EXAMINATION.

May 31st, 1853.

1.—4722. Sir C. Eastlake.] I am not sufficiently acquainted with Claude's practice to say whether *any glazing* has been removed from the lights of the 'Sheba.' I should say of Claude, that if he was not a glazer, he *ought* to have been one.

2.—4752. Sir C. Eastlake.] I am not acquainted with the practice of Claude *sufficiently to say* whether he would have put *glazings* over his lights. If you ask me whether certain portions of the 'Sheba' *require* glazing or not, I can tell you, but whether it was Claude's general practice or not, *I do not know*.

##### THIRD EXAMINATION.

June 17th, 1853.

6232-3-4. Sir C. Eastlake.] I have *no doubt* that Claude *glazed* his pictures. The pictures of Claude afford *sufficient evidence of it*. I came to that conclusion *originally*.



"the wooden effect," &c.,\*—his career has been signalised by repeated waste of public money on most objectionable and spurious works, by the neglect and defacement of Masterpieces, and by contradictions, evasions, and absurdities, such as might well outstrip belief, but for the incontestible record we possess of their existence.†

In 1850, as "Commissioner appointed to inquire into the state of the Pictures in the National Gallery," selecting as his "type," on account of the "obscurity of its condition,—from *dirt*," the "small 'Annunciation,' by Claude," he is so sensitive of "dirt," as to make the dirt upon that picture, a weighty argument for the removal of the Gallery to Kensington.‡ In 1853, he has

Eastlake's  
and Russell's  
Evid. 4590,  
4826-54.

Rep. p. xvii.

\* SIR C. EASTLAKE P.R.A. v. HOGARTH.

6231. Sir C. Eastlake.] With regard to the inequalities of glazings, or of the patina produced by TIME, such accidental inequalities are generally preferable to varieties contrived by the will of the Artist.

HOGARTH.] "Nothing can be more absurd than the notion that TIME is a great improver of good pictures. TIME cannot give a picture more union and harmony than has been in the power of a skilful master, with all his rules of Art to do."

† As an instance of the waste of public money on incompetency, it may be mentioned that, besides his four years' salary, from 1843 to 1847, as Keeper or Director of the National Gallery, this nominee of Ministerial and Court favour has been for the last thirteen or fourteen years, and continues to be, in the receipt of £700 a-year, as "Secretary" to that mockery entitled "The Royal Commission for Promoting and Encouraging the Fine Arts in the United Kingdom."

‡ Sir C. Eastlake quotes Mr. Faraday in support of the assertion made by himself and Mr. W. Russell, that before the cleaning, "The

become so violently enamoured of "dirt," as a cloak for the ghastly effect of his own picture-cleaning, that nothing less will satisfy him than to "recommend" that *this very*

4723, 4592. *same* 'Annunciation' should be *exposed to dirt*,—"rubbed

4590. "Annunciation' was in *a very bad state*." Mr. Faraday himself shall say with what right:—

Sir C. EASTLAKE and Mr. FARADAY.

4590. Sir C. Eastlake.] When on the Commission with Mr. William Russell and Mr. Faraday, 'The Annunciation' was brought to us. PROFESSOR FARADAY was of opinion that it was covered with *dirt* and varnish, and *an accumulation of matter which had nothing to do with THE ORIGINAL PAINTING*.

5498, 5542, 5552-3. Mr. Faraday.] *I do not remember* to have found 'The Annunciation' dirty. I can form *no judgment* with respect to the *alteration of colour*, nor as to whether colour observable on pictures is a change of colour by time, or whether it is a colour put on by the artist. I have not the *slightest means* of knowing whether a tint is of *ancient* or of *modern* date. I left matters of that kind rather to Sir C. Eastlake and Mr. Russell.

Mr. Faraday's statement, therefore, is an entire repudiation of Sir C. Eastlake's assertion respecting himself and 'The Annunciation.' Here we have, on the one hand, Mr. Faraday, a man eminent in science, who gives his evidence with intelligence and candour; who moreover, has *no private interest to serve* by anything he may say on this subject; on the other, Sir C. Eastlake, who contradicts himself at every turn, whose intelligence may be measured by his dictum that "early German Art was *corrupted* by a *classical* influence"—as though a *classical* influence *could* "corrupt;" whose candour, by his attempt to throw upon the late Sir Robert Peel, upon Mr. Hume, upon the Trustees, upon the *system*—upon *anybody* or *anything*, that responsibility which he *knows* to belong to *himself alone*; and who, above all, as President of a *private Society* that has been for years caballing to aggrandize itself by obtaining permanent possession of the present Site



"over with dirt," for "dirt" is now a "benefit;"\* a *benefit* which he vouchsafes to offer us as the Presidential specific for imparting an exquisite "gusto." This expression means, he assures us, "in Hazlitt's sense," 4725-6. the "perfection in touch," which "the works of the *best Masters exhibit*;" a freedom of quotation that would be impertinent in any one but the President of a Royal Academy; since, upon turning to Hazlitt himself for the purpose of studying a writer sanctioned by so great an authority, we find that Hazlitt really says—and the passage occurs in his 'Criticism on the Catalogue Raisonné of the British Institution,'—that "gusto" is "*high expression, the highest and first part of Art*;" 105-6. "one of the three things," pleasantly remarks that well-known panegyrist of the Royal Academy, in which Royal Academicians "*are notoriously deficient*."† So much for *the other half* of "The Commission of 1850."

Criticisms on  
Art, pp.  
105-6.

---

himself a prime mover in the plot, is both *corporately* and *individually* interested in coining pretexts for the expulsion of the National pictures. *Utri creditis Quirites?*

\* Prepared for every contingency in contradiction, this President of the Royal Academy says:—"It is quite possible that you may make 4766. "me *appear* to contradict myself; get me beyond a *certain point* and I "shall, *in all sincerity*, say EXACTLY THE REVERSE of *what I said before*."

† We have had to comment on Messrs Stanfield's, Dyce's, and Sir C. Eastlake's attempts to palm upon the Public, as earnest convictions in favour of the cleaning, statements which they were subsequently driven to confess they had made without either a sufficient acquaintance with the previous state of the pictures, or a sufficient knowledge of the masters to entitle them to a hearing. We must now notice *another* species of *legerdemain* practised by the two last-named Royal Academi-

Such is the *origin*, and such are the *credentials* of that "Commission," in deference to whose "adverse opinion" against the present Site, the Committee "recommend" the Removal of the National Gallery."

And now that we have unmasked this "Commission of 1850," will the Nation submit to the curtailment of

cians. Relying on the "credulity or connivance" of the Committee,  
 4837. or, may be, on what Mr. W. Russell calls the Committee's "certainly  
 "limited powers of discrimination," they seize upon an accredited  
 author, falsify his opinions so as to make them countenance whatever  
 assertions they would have pass current, and foist on the Public their  
*rap* as sterling coin.

Sir C. Eastlake does not limit himself to misstating Hazlitt's defini-  
 tion of "gusto." He must also make Hazlitt sponsor for his prepos-  
 4725. terous judgment that the "touch" or "execution" of Claude in his  
 "large weeds in the foreground and the larger leaves in the fore-  
 2727-9. "ground trees," in his "middle distance," in his "architecture," &c. is  
 4722-5. "without feeling—mechanical—*wooden*;" and he invites the Committee  
 to attest the accuracy of the quotation. "You are probably ac-  
 4725. "quainted," he says to them, "with the writings of William Hazlitt;  
 "he makes use of the expression, 'gusto,' to define that broken  
 "irregularity of touch which the works of the best masters exhibit—the  
 4726. "opposite of what I have expressed by a sort of *wooden* appearance in  
 "the touch, a certain approach to the *mechanical*; I forget whom he  
 "instances as examples of the perfection of *gusto* in touch, but he  
 4725. "instances CLAUDE as an example of the WANT of it."

And first, we may observe that the mixture of "perfection" and  
 "gusto" with "touch," or "execution," is Sir C. Eastlake's own.  
 Hazlitt keeps to his definition of "gusto" as we have given it in  
 the text, and treats "touch" or "execution" as a distinct quality. He  
 says that the Dutch Masters are "instructive enough" in the latter,  
 while he denies them the former; and he *again* marks the distinction



their means of instruction and intellectual enjoyment, at the will of so egregious a counterfeit? The Removal of the State Collection of Works by the Great Masters to a distant locality, would be a blow to Civilisation; for, the difficulty of access, and its concomitant impediments to study, would be felt not only by the Metropolis,

between "gusto" and "execution," by declaring that the Academicians possess *neither*.

Secondly, not only does Hazlitt *not* "instance Claude as an example of the want" of either what *he* means by "gusto," *i. e.* "high expression," beauty of style, or of the *want* of "gusto in touch," as Sir C. Eastlake asserts—as an example of "woodenness;" but he actually recommends him as one of the highest examples of *both*. After referring to Claude's works as being among those of high "gusto and grand effect—of the greatest gusto," he says; "take Claude's landscapes as an example"—not of the *want* of perfection in execution, not of *woodenness*—but of "*nicety* of execution, *fidelity* of imitation, in the highest degree; whether in his *trees*, or in his plants in the *foreground*, in his distances, or in his *middle distances*, in his sky, or in his water, or in his buildings," *i. e.* *architecture*, &c. And it is this very same Claude whom this President of the Royal Academy calls "WOODEN," that Hazlitt brings forward to refute the extravagant *modern* fallacy, that perfection of "detail," "*nicety* of execution, *fidelity* of imitation, are useless or *improper* in works of high gusto and grand effect."

Enough has been said to show that Sir C. Eastlake has deliberately perverted his author. But, as this falsification of Hazlitt's opinion of Claude was designed to trick the Public into the belief, by means of the authority of so popular a writer, that the *present truly* "WOODEN" appearance to which Sir C. Eastlake has reduced our Claudes by "destroying," as he admits, "the softness of their outlines," &c., is the *normal* appearance of Claude's works, a few extracts from Hazlitt's writings will complete the vindication of their author from the aspersions

but by the whole Empire, and by every Foreigner who might visit our shores.

That we yield to none in zeal for the preservation of the National pictures, this PROTEST is gage. We have maintained, in direct contradiction to the Committee, that the present Site is NOT "unfavourable to the preservation of pictures." In this we have been backed by the authority of two of our most eminent men of

of Sir C. Eastlake, and expose the *magnitude* as well as the *audacity* of the cheat.

"The refinements not only of *execution*, but of truth and nature."—  
 "The exquisite *gradations* and *harmony* of a sky of Claude's."

"The *perfect* landscapes of the *all-accomplished* Claude."

"Claude *always* exquisite, sometimes *beyond compare*."

"Claude's pictures have become a sentiment in the heart of Europe, and his fame has been stamped and rendered *sacred* by the hand of time."

"Azure skies and *golden* sunsets of Claude Lorraine."

"The luxuriant beauty and *divine harmony* of Claude."

Lastly, Hazlitt asks:—

"Is the general effect in Claude's pictures injured by the details?  
 "Is the truth inconsistent with the beauty of the imitation? Does the  
 "perpetual profusion of objects and scenery, *all PERFECT in themselves*,  
 "interfere with the simple grandeur and comprehensive magnificence  
 "of the whole? Does the precision with which a plant is marked in  
 "the *foreground*, take away the *air-drawn* distinctions of the blue  
 "glimmering horizon? Is there any want of that endless *airy* space,  
 "where the eye wanders at liberty under the open sky, explores  
 "distant objects, and returns back as from a delightful journey?  
 "His landscapes have ALL THAT IS REQUISITE IN ART AND NATURE.  
 "Every thing is moulded into grace and *harmony*; and at the touch  
 "of his pencil, shepherds with their flocks, temples and groves, and



science. The one, Mr. Faraday, by an experiment which exhausts the question of injury to pictures from atmospheric agency, has demonstrated that no danger need be feared from the present Site. The other, Sir David Brewster, has pointed out as being still in "perfect" condition, pictures which have been in the Gallery ever since

Protest, pp. 81-85.

Idem, pp. 34 & 83, and Blue Book, 5564.

"winding glades and scattered hamlets, rise up in never-ending  
"succession, under the azure sky and the resplendent sun, while—

'Universal Pan,  
Knit with the Graces and the Hours in dance,  
Leads on the eternal spring.'

"Michael Angelo has left in one of his sonnets a fine apostrophe to  
"the earliest poet of Italy—

'Fain would I to be what our Dante was,  
Forego the happiest fortunes of mankind!'

"what landscape painter does not feel this of CLAUDE?"—*Hazlitt's Criticisms on Art.*

Of the same character as Sir C. Eastlake's perversion of Hazlitt, was Mr. Dyce's of Armenini; both having had for their object *to overthrow the charges against the cleaning*; the one, by inducing the belief that the *present* state of the mangled pictures is their *original* state, the other, by denying that there is any ancient written authority for supposing that the substance alleged to have been removed had *ever existed*. Mr. Morris Moore upon being asked by the Committee, whether he had any authority besides "a conviction founded on 2435.  
"his own experience and belief, that the Great Masters used  
"glazings," quoted among *other* ancient authorities that particularly mention glazing, a work entitled "De' veri Precetti della Pittura," 2436.  
by Armenini, a contemporary of Titian. It came to Mr. Dyce's turn to be examined. When questioned upon Armenini, with 3843.  
reference to glazing, he admits that there *were* contemporary writers on these subjects, but unhesitatingly declares that they

Protest, p. 94.

Hazlitt on  
the Catal.  
Raisonné of  
British Inst.  
*Criticisms on  
Art*, p. 121.

its establishment. We have, besides, adduced the admission of Mr. Segquier the "cleaner," that the obscurity observable in some of the pictures,—a circumstance for the most part confined to such as were *originally of a deep tone*,—is owing to the repeated application of deleterious matter by himself. Had we been at a loss for an argument in favour of the present Site, we might perhaps have quoted, as not the least significant, "the selfish opportunity of a gang of sturdy beggars, who, demanding public encouragement and support with a claim of settlement in one hand, and a forged certificate of merit in the other"—and holding *a hundred and forty thousand pounds in the funds*—are perpetually manœuvring to obtain permanent possession of it. Thus much of the safety of the present Site. But if UTILITY demanded some remote infinitesimal sacrifice, that is, if by such sacrifice we so multiplied the opportunities for study as to increase in a vastly preponderating ratio the chances of REPRODUCTION, that sacrifice must be made.

---

"do not enter into details." He then, with as little ceremony says, that "Armenini describes the practice of his *own* "school," which, according to Mr. Dyce, is that of "Ferrara," and that "his 3845. "work is interesting on *that* account." The *fact* however is, and it 10,010. was fully explained by Mr. Morris Moore in his last evidence, namely, his evidence on the Purchases, that Armenini was of *Faenza*, a city which appears to be confounded in Mr. Dyce's geography with *Ferrara*; that he *does* enter into details about glazing; and that so far from the interest of his work consisting "in its being confined to describing the "practice" of a *particular and inferior school*, it is infinitely more so, because it is, as its author emphatically declares, an exposition of the practice of "the most excellent artists that have existed;" that is, *of the principles of Art*



Inaccessible, of what avail even the greatest of Masterpieces?—even the Phidian Theseus itself? Not seeing, how emulate? *Accessibility* then is the measure of *utility*. “Art subsists by communication, not by “exclusion.” It is not the number of years that a Masterpiece is preserved, *but the number of eyes that see it*, which forms its value to mankind. For if preservation is to be the *sole* idea, then we had better at once enclose it in the exhausted receiver of an air-pump, and, content to know that it is *safe*, care to know no more.

We PROTEST against the conduct of the Committee in bringing forward, as an argument for the removal of the National Gallery, the “opinion” of the “Commission of 1850;” since, of the three members who composed that Commission, Mr. Faraday, the sole one whose testimony deserved notice, had explicitly stated in his evidence, that upon the *condition* of the pictures, the *only* question that could render such a measure expedient, *he was unable to form any judgment*: and of the other two members, namely, Mr. William Russell and Sir C. Eastlake, the former had virtually confessed himself to be profoundly ignorant of all *professional*, and consequently, of all *reliable* information on the subject; while the utter incompetency of the latter had not only been established by the evidence, but fully admitted by the Committee themselves.

We PROTEST against this attempt of the Committee to palm upon the Public as *valid*, an argument which they *knew* to be WORTHLESS.

On the 8th of March, 1853, when Col. Mure moved for the appointment of a "Select Committee to inquire into the Management of the National Gallery," Mr. Gladstone, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, assured the House of Commons that "the Government had arrived at no decision whatever on the removal of the Gallery." He declared, moreover, that he "*entirely agreed with those who thought this a matter in which the Public were deeply interested, and* OUGHT TO BE HEARD;" and that, "*if the Public were opposed to it, a removal* WOULD NOT TAKE PLACE."\* This declaration was, virtually, a pledge that the Government would take means to elicit an expression of public feeling on the subject. On the 1st of August, 1854, Mr. Danby Seymour asked the question, "whether it was the intention of the Government to take measures to collect the whole of the ancient pictures belonging to the Nation, such as the 'Minden Gallery,' and others recently purchased, into the National Gallery in Trafalgar Square; and whether this desirable object could be perfectly effected without giving notice to the Royal Academy, that the apartments hitherto *lent* them would be required *for the Public service.*"† In defiance of his recent declaration, and in marked contempt for the Public, this same Mr. Gladstone, again the spokesman of the Government, replies, that "it was the intention of the Government to propose to Parliament to give them the means of building a new Gallery for the National Collection of Pictures. With respect to the

---

\* Public Journals, March 9th, 1853.

† Public Journals, August 2nd, 1854.



“question of bringing the collection of these pictures into the National Collection, *of course* that was contemplated by the Government, and they were anxious to effect it at *the earliest moment*. But whether there was *accommodation* for these pictures in the present building in Trafalgar Square, so that the Public might enjoy the sight of them,”—the *Minden* Pictures—“was a matter which had not yet been determined, and must depend in some degree upon *the number of the pictures which would be retained*. “As to giving notice to the Royal Academy to vacate the portion of the building occupied by them, *the Government had no intention of giving any such notice, or requiring them to vacate those premises*.” The Government then without even a show of redeeming their pledge, have decided on the removal of the Gallery.

We denounce this violation of faith with the Public, as the first step in the German chronological Job.

The building in Trafalgar Square, the ground-rent of which is valued at some thousands a year, cost the Nation £100,000. As it was thought on its completion that, for some time to come, one-half of it would suffice for the National Collection, the Royal Academy were allowed to occupy the other half, on the distinct understanding however, as was stated in the House of Commons, on the 14th April 1834, by Mr. Spring Rice, then Chancellor of the Exchequer, “*that the Royal Academy should obtain only the USE of the rooms, but that the PROPERTY of them should rest in the PUBLIC, and that if the resumption of these apartments became desirable, the Academy should*

Hansard's  
Debates.

“RESIGN THEM.”\* The period at which it became “desirable that the Royal Academy should resign these “apartments” arrived long since. This is proved by the Minutes of the Trustees. We there find that pictures

---

\* THE NATION v. THE ROYAL ACADEMY.

MR. WARBURTON, MR. SPRING RICE (LORD MONTEAGLE),  
SIR ROBERT PEEL, MR. HUME, AND LORD JOHN RUSSELL  
Versus SIR C. EASTLAKE P. R. A.

Mr. Warburton “wished to know *what terms* had “been made with the Royal Academy, and whether “it was to be understood that the space which was “to be given to the Royal Academy in the National “Gallery would be given up by them, if it should be “hereafter wanted for the purposes of the National “Gallery itself. He thought that the Government “should retain in its hands the power of taking “possession of that space of ground hereafter if it “should be wanted.”

Mr. Spring Rice “was very glad that his honourable friend had put that question to him. “An arrangement had been entered into which he “supposed his honourable friend would approve of— “namely, that the Royal Academy should obtain “only the use of the rooms, but that the property “of them should rest in the PUBLIC, and that if “the resumption of these apartments became desirable, the Academy should RESIGN them.”

Sir Robert Peel “did not dispute the right of the “Public to take the apartments in question from the “Royal Academy, should the number of pictures in “the National Gallery be so increased as to render “it desirable to do so.”—*Hansard's Debates*, April 14th, 1834.

Mr. Hume “said that when the late Mr. Vernon

4662-3-4-5. Sir C. Eastlake.] I have no such impression as that the whole building does belong to the National Gallery. I am not aware that the Trustees of the National Gallery have, if they think fit to exercise it, ANY CLAIM to the portion of the building occupied by the Royal Academy, should they think it necessary for the purposes of the National Gallery, and I BELIEVE THEY HAVE NO SUCH CLAIM. I am not aware that the question was publicly asked of Mr. Spring Rice, when he was Chancellor of the Exchequer, whether the Academy had or



have been repeatedly refused, not only when offered for sale, but even as gifts; the Trustees alleging as the excuse for their refusal, that they had "not the means, from the

Min. of Trus.  
of 1845-7,  
pp. 3, 6, 8,  
&c., and *Ib.*  
1847-52, p.  
4, &c.

"gave his pictures to the Nation, a Committee of that House was appointed to consider the best mode of providing for their public exhibition, and that that Committee recommended that the collection should be placed in the National Gallery, and that the members of the Royal Academy should obtain suitable accommodation for THEMSELVES elsewhere."

Lord John Russell said "that the Government intended to act in conformity with the recommendation of the report to which the honourable member (Mr. Hume) had alluded. The Royal Academicians would be obliged to find suitable accommodation FOR THEMSELVES out of the National Gallery, and the Vernon pictures would ultimately be placed in that building."—*Hansard's Debates, Thursday, April 11th, 1850.*

had not a mere permissive right to the building, and that his reply was, that they had a permissive right merely. *I am not aware that it would have been desirable for the Trustees to have exercised their right of claiming the building had they required the space.*—*Blue Book, 1853.*

Sir C. Eastlake must have an unlimited confidence in the credulity of the Public, to venture upon the declaration, that "HE IS NOT AWARE that the Nation have any claim to the portion of the building occupied by the Royal Academy, and that HE BELIEVES they have no such claim." But whether Sir C. Eastlake's ignorance of the right of the Nation to expel the Royal Academy from the National Gallery, *when- ever they think fit*, be real or feigned, it is high time, independently of his professional incapacity, that he should cease to be a Trustee. It is a preposterous anomaly that any man should be a Trustee of the National Gallery, who, owing a superior allegiance to a *private Society*, is both corporately and individually interested in preventing the Nation from resuming possession of that portion of their building, the alienation of which has so long impeded the enlargement of the Collection.

“*limited space* at their disposal on the walls of the Gallery, to receive many works of art, which might *otherwise*—that is, were the Royal Academy to *quit*—“be considered *eligible*.”\* But the Royal Academy, upon additional space being required for the enlargement of the Collection, instead of vacating the National Gallery, *according to agreement*, and erecting a building out of the *hundred and forty thousand pounds* which they possess in the funds—a sum accumulated, as Mr. Danby Seymour recently informed the House of Commons, *in contravention of the conditions of their Trust*—raise a false alarm that the atmosphere of the present Site is “unfavourable to the preservation” of the *National* pictures—though sufficiently salubrious for *their own*—and under cover of affected zeal for the safety of that which they, at other times, make no scruple of *reviling*, attempt to filch from the Public, not only the part they have borrowed, but that which remains of the building, and, from *tenants on sufferance* of half, to instal themselves *masters in fee simple* of the whole.

Public Journals, July 4th  
1854.

The Committee admit that since the Report of the

Report, p.  
xvii.

---

\* At a meeting of the Trustees on the 1st of March 1847, the following Resolution was passed:—

“That it appears to the Trustees that offers of pictures of considerable merit, as *free gifts* to the Gallery, ARE FREQUENTLY MADE, which there is a difficulty in accepting from the want of sufficient space for their reception in the Gallery.”

A Resolution to the same effect often occurs in the Minutes of the Trustees.



Commission of 1850 was issued, "complaints have been made by a portion of the Public favourable to the present Site of the Gallery, that the question as to its relative merits and disadvantages, had not been thoroughly sifted." They then say that they "have, therefore, entered *fully* into that question."

We PROTEST against this statement as contrary to fact; since it was impossible for the Committee to "enter fully" into that, or into any other question of importance relating to the National Gallery, without instituting a searching inquiry into the conduct and claims of the Royal Academy. Yet so far were the Committee from doing this, that they avowed, from the first, a determination to receive no evidence that might interfere with that body. This determination they carried out not only by the most vexatious behaviour to any witness who attempted to point out the intimate connexion between the Academy and the mismanagement of the National Gallery, but by actually refusing evidence on the express ground that it "tended to implicate the Royal Academy." As further reason for concluding that the Committee, in dealing with the question of Site, acted upon a foregone conclusion to favour the project of the Royal Academy to oust the National pictures, and possess themselves of the entire building in Trafalgar Square, we may instance the exaggerated stress they lay on "the expense and difficulty" with which "the enlargement of the Gallery, on its present Site, would be attended," although they could not but have been aware

Davis's Protest, Times, and Morning Post, May 26th, 1853.

Report, p. xvi.

Gladstone's  
Speech,  
March 8th,  
1853.

Blue Book,  
pp. 625, 724.

that various plans exist, which plainly show that the Gallery could, with the greatest facility, be so improved and enlarged there, as to furnish ample room for all its requirements both present and future. As another specimen of their mode of dealing with "a matter in which "the Public are deeply interested, *and ought to be "heard,"* we may mention that a plan submitted to them by a gentleman, for the *retention* of the Gallery on its present Site, is not even alluded to in the Report, while the opinions and suggestions of a party who advocates the *removal* of the Gallery, are repeatedly quoted in the same document, and *two* of *his* plans prominently published in the Blue Book.

We PROTEST against this *one-sided* manner of treating a great Public question.

Min. of Sel.  
Com. on Arts  
and Princip.  
of Design,  
1836. Wil-  
kins's Evid.  
1167, 1429-  
30, 1168.

When it is considered that the National Gallery, ever since it was proposed to allow the Royal Academy "the "use" of apartments in the same building—now nearly *a quarter of a century*—has been subject either to the secret influence or direct control of that body; that the construction of that building was entrusted to a Royal Academician, who, as the first step in the execution of his trust, suggested nothing less than the appropriation of half the building *to his own Society*; and that a Committee of the Royal Academy actually sat "to report "to the Government, whether the arrangements made "by the Government would suit the purposes of the



“Royal Academy;”—when it is considered, that the interior of the building was not planned with regard to the end which the Nation had in view, and for which the Nation’s money was voted, but clandestinely contrived so as to subserve the schemes of the Royal Academy; that owing to the intrusion of this PRIVATE Society, “want of space” has been frequently alleged as the plea for driving from the doors of the National Gallery works offered, both for purchase and as gifts, works, by the admission of the Trustees and of the Academicians in office at the Gallery, except for that intrusion, “eligible;” that the presence of the Royal Academy has actually caused the partial dispersion of the Collection; and that the proposals occasionally made to enlarge the space, in order to prevent so objectionable a measure, have been defeated by the manœuvres of the Royal Academy, because the plan did not promise sufficient advantages for themselves;—when, besides, it is considered that the Royal Academy having already twelve years previously installed their President a Trustee *ex officio*, have ever since 1843 taken upon themselves the active management of the National Gallery, by placing successively in the Keepership two of their own members, Sir C. Eastlake and Mr. Uwins, whose official delinquencies and incapacity they have never failed to either secretly abet or openly defend; and that taking advantage of the ascendancy obtained over the Gallery and over the Trustees, and setting at naught the right of every British citizen to *an equal share* in the advantages of the Institution, they have even arrogated, as though dealing with their own private property, that

Sel. Com.  
on Nat. Gal-  
lery of 1850.  
App. D.  
Eastlake’s  
Evid. 80, and  
Penne-  
thorne’s,  
20 et seq.  
Com. of  
1847-8.

Min. of Trust  
of 1845-6,  
p. 3.

TWENTY *places should be reserved in the NATIONAL Gallery exclusively for THEMSELVES* ;\*—when all these things are considered, it must be obvious that a Committee “appointed to inquire into the Management of the “National Gallery,” who start with the determination to enter into no question and to receive no evidence which may “tend to implicate the Royal Academy,” virtually set out resolved to evade all investigation of the *causes*, owing to which, after an expenditure of MORE THAN A QUARTER OF A MILLION OF PUBLIC MONEY, the attempt to establish a National Gallery worthy of the Country has ended in failure and disgrace.

The COMMITTEE declare that they have performed

---

\* “At a meeting of the Trustees of the National Gallery, held on Monday, the 5th of May, 1845 :—

“The Trustees took into their consideration a memorial read at the “last meeting from certain students of *the Royal Academy*, praying the “Trustees to afford *them* increased facilities for painting in oil colours “in the National Gallery.

“Resolved, That the Keeper”—Sir C. Eastlake—“be authorized to “permit 20 students of the Royal Academy (*in addition* to the “number of *general* students already permitted to paint in oil colours “in the Gallery) to be admitted for the purpose of studying according “to the prayer of the memorial, for such periods and under such re- “gulations as shall be determined upon by the Keeper, after commu- “nicating with the *authorities of the Royal Academy*, and with the “students themselves.”

These TWENTY PLACES IN A PUBLIC INSTITUTION which the Trustees have taken upon themselves to make over to a *private society* are THE COMMON PROPERTY OF THE ENGLISH NATION, not the perquisite of the hangers-on of a *clique*.



their duty. WE maintain that they have BETRAYED IT.

WE PROTEST AGAINST THE REPORT as a Document UNWORTHY OF CONFIDENCE, as INIMICAL TO ART, and as A FRAUD UPON THE NATION.

\*FREDERICK Y. HURLSTONE.

\*WILLIAM CONINGHAM.

\*GEORGE ALFRED ARNEY.

\*ALFRED STEVENS.

\*RICHARD EVANS.

WALTER SAVAGE LANDOR.

GEORGE LONG.

ALFRED B. RICHARDS.

PHILIP EDWARD BARNES.

CHARLES FREDERICK PERKINS.

THOMAS WAKLEY.

JOHN INGRAM LOCKHART.

ROBERT BARNES, M.D.

JOHN HAMILTON.

"AN ENGLISHMAN."

HYDE CLARKE.

EDWARD MAYHEW.

JAMES TAYLOR, PH.D.

The Asterisks mark the names of Witnesses examined by the  
Committee.

They maintain that they have estimated

The Protest against the Report as a Document

of Contempt as Indignity to Art and as

Hand from the Nation

FREDERICK Y. FRIESTONE

WILLIAM CONINGHAM

GEORGE ALFRED ARNETT

ALFRED STEVENS

RICHARD EVANS

WALTER SAVAGE LANDOR

GEORGE LONG

ALFRED B. RICHARDS

PHILIP EDWARD BARNES

CHARLES FREDERICK PERKINS

THOMAS WATKINS

JOHN INGRAM LOCKHART

ROBERT BARNES, M.D.

JOHN HAMILTON

"AN ENGLISHMAN"

HYDE CLARKE

EDWARD MAYHEW

JAMES TAYLOR, F.R.D.

The Artists mark the names of Witnesses examined by the

Committee



## APPENDIX No. I.

## DATE of the Appointment of the Trustees of the NATIONAL GALLERY.

(Deceased)	.	.	.	2 July, 1824	.	.	The Earl of Liverpool.
				"	.	.	The Earl of Ripon.
				"	.	.	The Earl of Aberdeen.
(Deceased)	.	.	.	"	.	.	Lord Farnborough.
(Deceased)	.	.	.	"	.	.	Sir George Beaumont.
(Deceased)	.	.	.	"	.	.	Sir Thomas Lawrence.
(Deceased)	.	.	.	12 July, 1827	.	.	Lord Dover.
(Deceased)	.	.	.	"	.	.	Sir Robert Peel.
(Deceased)	.	.	.	25 October, 1831	.	.	Earl Grey.
				"	.	.	Lord Colborne.
(Deceased)	.	.	.	"	.	.	Sir Martin Archer Shee, P.R.A.
				11 March, 1834	.	.	Marquis of Lansdowne.
				4 April, 1834	.	.	Samuel Rogers, Esq.
				26 February, 1835	.	.	The Duke of Sutherland.
				"	.	.	The Earl of Ellesmere.
(Deceased)	.	.	.	"	.	.	Sir Charles Bagot.
				"	.	.	Lord Monteaale.
(Deceased)	.	.	.	"	.	.	Lord Ashburton.
				"	.	.	Sir James Graham.
(Deceased)	.	.	.	"	.	.	William Wells, Esq.
(Deceased)	.	.	.	"	.	.	The Marquis of Northampton.
				13 August, 1850	.	.	Lord Overstone.
				"	.	.	Lord Ashburton.
				"	.	.	William Russell, Esq.
				25 October, 1850	.	.	Thomas Baring, Esq.
				18 October, 1850	.	.	Sir Charles L. Eastlake, P.R.A.
				11 April, 1851	.	.	The Marquis of Northampton.

## OFFICIAL TRUSTEES.

12 August, 1846	.	.	.	The First Lord of the Treasury.
"	.	.	.	The Chancellor of the Exchequer.

NB.—The Trustees who "Resolved" that the "cleaning" of 1852 had *improved the pictures*, were Lords Colborne, Lansdowne, Northampton, Monteaale, and Overstone, *Sir C. Eastlake*, and Mr. William Russell.—*Blue Book, App. No. III, p. 744.*

## APPENDIX No. II.

## LIST OF WITNESSES.

[Copied *verbatim* from the Blue Book.]*Tuesday, 26th April, 1853.*

- 1 Thomas Uwins, Esq., R.A.
- 2 George Saunders Thwaites, Esq.
- 3 Mr. John Seguier.

*Friday, 29th April, 1853.*

- Mr. John Seguier.
- 4 Mr. Retra Bolton.

*Tuesday, 3d May, 1853.*

- 5 Mr. Thomas Boden Brown.
- 6 Mr. Henry Farrer.
- 7 Mr. John Nieuwenhuys.

*Friday, 6th May, 1853.*

- 8 Mr. John Bentley.
- 9 Mr. Morris Moore.
- 10 Mr. George Alfred Arney.

*Tuesday, 10th May, 1853.*

- Mr. Morris Moore.
- 11 Mr. Richard Evans.
- 12 Mr. Henry Fradelle.

*Friday, 13th May, 1853.*

- Mr. Henry Fradelle.
- Thomas Uwins, Esq., R.A.
- Mr. John Seguier.
- 13 Mr. Thicke.

- 14 William Coningham, Esq.

*Friday, 20th May, 1853.*

Thomas Uwins, Esq., R.A.  
Mr. John Seguier.

- 15 Solomon Alex. Hart, Esq., R.A.
- 16 James Dennistoun, Esq.
- 17 Sir Thomas Sebright.
- 18 David Roberts, Esq., R.A.

*Monday, 23d May, 1853.*

- 19 Mr. Samuel Lawrence.
- 20 Clarkson Stansfield, Esq., R.A.
- 21 William Dyce, Esq., R.A.
- 22 Richard Ford, Esq.
- 23 Hugh Andrew John Munro, Esq.
- 24 Mr. Alfred Stevens.

*Friday, 27th May, 1853.*

- 25 Sir Edwin Landseer, R.A.
- William Dyce, Esq., R.A.
- 26 Edward Cheney, Esq.
- 27 Davenport Bromley, Esq.

*Tuesday, 31st May, 1853.*

- 28 Sir Charles Eastlake, P. R.A.

*Friday, 3d June, 1853.*

- 29 William Russell, Esq.
- 30 The Right Hon. Lord Monteagle.

*Monday, 6th June, 1853.*

- The Right Hon. Lord Monteagle.
- 31 Mr. George Lance.

*Friday, 10th June, 1853.*

- 32 The Right Hon. Earl Aberdeen.
- 33 The Right Hon. Lord Overstone.
- 34 Michael Faraday, Esq.
- 35 Sir David Brewster.

*Tuesday, 14th June, 1853.*

- 36 Mr. George Henry Christie.
- James Dennistoun, Esq.
- Sir Charles Eastlake, P. R.A.

*Friday, 17th June, 1853.*

Sir Charles Eastlake, P. R.A.

*Monday, 20th June, 1853.*

Sir Charles Eastlake, P. R.A.

*Friday, 24th June, 1853.*

Sir Charles Eastlake, P. R.A.

- 37 Frederick Hurlstone, Esq.
- William Coningham, Esq.

*Monday, 27th June, 1853.*

Frederick Hurlstone, Esq.

- 38 George Foggo, Esq.

*Thursday, 30th June, 1853.*

William Dyce, Esq., R.A.

- 39 Edward Hawkins, Esq.
- 40 Antonio Panizzi, Esq.

*Monday, 4th July, 1853.*

Mr. George Lance.

- 41 Mr. Hamilton Smith Day.
- Richard Ford, Esq.
- William Russell, Esq.

*Friday, 8th July, 1853.*

- 42 Major-General James Freeth.
- 43 Edmund Oldfield, Esq.
- 44 James Fergusson, Esq.
- 45 Edgar A. Bowering, Esq.
- 46 Thomas Cubitt, Esq.
- 47 James Pennethorne, Esq.

*Friday, 15th July, 1853.*

- 48 William Richard Hamilton, Esq.
- 49 Sir Richard Westmacott.
- 50 William Hookham Carpenter, Esq.
- 51 Mr. Francis Samuel Hayes.
- 52 Mr. Augustus Frederick Plass.
- 53 Mr. James Davies.
- 54 Mr. James Loft.

*Thursday, 21st July, 1853.*

- 55 Baron de Klenze.
- Mr. Henry Farrer.
- 56 The Rev. Henry Wellesley, D.D.

*Friday, 22d July, 1853.*

George Saunders Thwaites, Esq.  
Morris Moore, Esq.  
Mr. Henry Farrer.

- 57 Charles Baring Wall, Esq., M.P.
- 58 W. B. Spence, Esq.

*Friday, 29th July, 1853.*

- 59 Sir William Cubitt.
- J. Pennethorne, Esq.



## APPENDIX No. III.

## CONTENTS.

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION . . . . .	3
THE PURCHASING OF PICTURES . . . . .	8
THE PICTURE-CLEANING OF 1852—	
‘The Queen of Sheba’— <i>Claude</i> . . . . .	9
‘The Isaac and Rebecca’— <i>Claude</i> . . . . .	12
‘The Annunciation’— <i>Claude</i> . . . . .	13
‘A View in Venice’— <i>Canaletto</i> . . . . .	15
‘A View on the Grand Canal’— <i>Canaletto</i> . . . . .	16
‘The Conversion of St. Bavon’— <i>Rubens</i> . . . . .	17
‘The Consecration of St. Nicholas’— <i>P. Veronese</i> . . . . .	18
‘Angels Weeping over Christ’— <i>Guercino</i> . . . . .	19
‘The Plague at Ashdod’— <i>N. Poussin</i> . . . . .	19
Majority of the Oral Evidence against the “Cleaning” . . . . .	20
Majority of the written Evidence against the “Cleaning,” and Mr. Leslie, R.A. <i>versus</i> Raphael, Sebastiano del Piombo, and all the Great Masters . . . . .	20, 21
THE PICTURE-CLEANING OF 1846— . . . . .	22
The Letters of the five Royal Academicians . . . . .	24, 25, 26
THE PICTURE-CLEANING OF 1852 <i>resumed</i> — . . . . .	27
Confirmation of the Charges against the “Cleaning” of 1852 by the Committee’s Seven Umpires . . . . .	28, 29
Confirmation of the Charges against the “Cleaning” of 1852 by Sir David Brewster . . . . .	31 to 35
Mr. William Russell’s Certificates in favour of the Cleaner . . . . .	35
Letter from the Earl of Onslow ( <i>Note</i> ) . . . . .	36
The Royal Academy and the Picture-cleaning of 1852 . . . . .	36 to 41
Hazlitt on the Royal Academy . . . . .	40, 41, 108
The Witnesses <i>versus</i> Mr. Uwins, R.A. . . . .	42
Lord Elcho <i>versus</i> Sir C. Eastlake, P.R.A. . . . .	43
Lord Elcho’s attempt to induce the Chief Witness to suppress his evidence on the Purchases . . . . .	42
Attempt by the Committee to excite a hostile feeling against the Chief Witness by perverting and misrepresenting his evidence . . . . .	44 to 49
The “Proceedings of the Committee” ( <i>Note</i> ) . . . . .	49
MANAGEMENT OF THE NATIONAL GALLERY—	
The Past Management . . . . .	50
Mr. Seguier, Sir C. Eastlake, P.R.A. Mr. W. Russell, and Lord Monteagle, <i>versus</i> Mr. Uwins, R.A. ( <i>Note</i> ) . . . . .	54 to 58
Sir C. Eastlake and the “Holbein” . . . . .	58, 59 and ( <i>Note</i> ) 99

MANAGEMENT OF THE NATIONAL GALLERY— <i>continued</i> —		PAGE
Sir Martin Shee, P.R.A., and Sir C. Eastlake, P.R.A. <i>versus</i> the Great Masters		59, 60
Mr. Hume, M.P., and Sir C. Eastlake		61
'Susanna and the Elders'		61
Purchase of the 'Tribute Money' ( <i>Note</i> )		62 to 66
Responsibility of the Keeper		66
Responsibility of Sir C. Eastlake, P.R.A.		68
Sir Robert Peel, Mr. Hume, and Sir C. Eastlake ( <i>Note</i> )		68 to 70
The Future Management		69
The Eight Resolutions of the Committee		69 to 77
The Competency of the "Board of Taste"		71
Sir C. Eastlake, Mr. W. Russell, Lord Monteagle, Lord Overstone, and the Resolution of the 12th Nov. 1852 ( <i>Note</i> )		72 to 75
THE SITE OF THE NATIONAL GALLERY		78 to 118
The Commission of 1850. Its Origin		80
Mr. Faraday on the Removal of the Gallery		81
Mr. William Russell and Sir C. Eastlake virtually "The Committee of 1850"		85
Mr. William Russell "an authority" for the Removal of the Gallery		85
Mr. William Russell's opinion of the "Cleaning" of 1852, and his great confidence in Mr. Seguier		91, 92
Mr. Russell's condemnation of the witnesses examined previously to himself		91, 92
Seguier (the Cleaner) <i>versus</i> Himself		93 to 95
Mr. William Russell's arguments in support of his favourable opinion of the "Cleaning" of 1852		95, 96
Mr. W. Russell, <i>versus</i> Himself ( <i>Note</i> )		96
Sir Charles Eastlake "an authority" for the Removal of the Gallery		98
Sir C. Eastlake <i>versus</i> Himself ( <i>Note</i> )		100
Sir C. Eastlake <i>versus</i> Hogarth ( <i>Note</i> )		101
Sir C. Eastlake Secretary to the Royal Commission ( <i>Note</i> )		101
Sir C. Eastlake <i>versus</i> Mr. Faraday ( <i>Note</i> )		102
Sir C. Eastlake <i>versus</i> Hazlitt ( <i>Note</i> )		103 to 107
Mr. Dyce, R.A. <i>versus</i> Armenini ( <i>Note</i> )		107
Mr. Gladstone <i>versus</i> the Nation		110, 111
Cost of the Building in Trafalgar Square		111
The Nation <i>versus</i> the Royal Academy ( <i>Note</i> )		112, 113
Total Cost of the National Gallery		118
CONCLUSION		118
APPENDIX, No. I—		
Date of the Appointment of the Trustees of the National Gallery, and the names of the Trustees present at the Meeting of the 12th of November, 1852		121
APPENDIX, No. II—		
List of the Witnesses		122



xxxvi, 26  
714, 1\*4, 2-78,  
84, 91  
124 pp.

## NOTICE TO THE PUBLIC.

♦

SINCE the PROTEST AND COUNTER-STATEMENT went to Press, Sir Charles Eastlake,—the same Eastlake who, at the Meeting of the Trustees of the 12th of November 1852, agreed to the “Resolution” that the National pictures recently “cleaned” by his authority had been *improved* by the operation, although he *knew* that they had been *injured*,\*—the same Eastlake who was convicted of the most flagrant incompetency by the all but *unanimous* decision of the witnesses examined by the late Committee,†—the same Eastlake whose incompetency the Committee themselves, in spite of their manœuvres to screen him, were compelled to admit,‡ and whom Lord Elcho the leading member of the Committee, because virtually its mover, repeatedly and in the presence of witnesses, begged the chief witness not to “kick” because he was “down,”§—the same Eastlake who, after owning his *entire* responsibility for the purchase of THE SPURIOUS HOLBEIN, has *himself* confessed his own *incompetency* by declaring that the purchase of that picture “is *such a mistake as he can hardly think such a Director as he thinks fit for the National Gallery would make*,”||—THIS SAME EASTLAKE HAS BEEN *Re-APPOINTED* DIRECTOR OF THE NATIONAL GALLERY, WITH HIS SALARY INCREASED FROM TWO HUNDRED POUNDS, TO ONE THOUSAND POUNDS A YEAR.

If anything could aggravate the insolence of this stretch of PATRONAGE, it would be that a Mr. Wornum who, in a letter to the *Times* on the 29th of December 1852, pronounced an unconditional approval of Sir C. Eastlake’s “Picture-cleaning,” has been appointed Secretary of the National Gallery, with a large salary, AT THE RECOMMENDATION OF THE SAME SIR C. EASTLAKE.

\* \* \* A POSTSCRIPT to the PROTEST AND COUNTER-STATEMENT will shortly appear upon this subject.

---

\* Protest and Counter-Statement, p. 73.

† *Idem*, p. 43.

§ *Idem*, p. 43.

† *Idem*, p. 20.

|| *Idem*, p. 60.